

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY



Vicarious Satisfaction:
A Study in Ecclesiastical Terminology
HENRY W. REIMANN

The Vicarious Atonement in John Quenstedt
ROBERT D. PREUS

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXII

February 1961

No. 2

T
—
—

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Volume XXXII

February 1961

Number 2

Published by

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH—MISSOURI SYNOD

Edited by

THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI

TI

Vol. X

Vicari
H

The V

BRIEF

HOMI

THEO

BOOK

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., to which all business correspondence is to be addressed. \$3.50 per annum, anywhere in the world, payable in advance. Second-class postage paid at St. Louis, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XXXII

February 1961

No. 2

Vicarious Satisfaction: A Study in Ecclesiastical Terminology HENRY W. REIMANN	69
The Vicarious Atonement in John Quenstedt. ROBERT D. PREUS	78
BRIEF STUDIES	98
HOMILETICS	108
THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER	117
BOOK REVIEW	121

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

VICTOR BARTLING, PAUL M. BRETSCHER
ALFRED O. FUERBRINGER, GEORGE W. HOYER
ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN, WALTER R. ROEHRs
LEWIS W. SPITZ, GILBERT A. THIELE

*Address all communications to the Editorial Committee in care of
Walter R. Roebrs, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.*

Vi
A

THE
o
Chris
siona
ology
soteri
eccles
from
times
vital

Ye
"vica
either
reason
cal —
for
limita
theolo
reason
purpo
ine i
vicari
Bibli
quate
theolo
subst

Th
cussio
Aton
able.¹

1
of the
Also
views
in N
Semin

Vicarious Satisfaction: A Study in Ecclesiastical Terminology

By HENRY W. REIMANN

THERE is no dispute in modern theology on the importance of the work of Christ. Biblical, Reformation, and confessional studies have combined to recall theology to the importance of Christology and soteriology. Even the recent emphases on ecclesiology and eschatology, stemming from our ecumenical and apocalyptic times, have not been unproductive of more vital soteriological emphases.

Yet there is one soteriological formula, "vicarious satisfaction," which is frequently either criticized or simply discarded. The reason for this opposition may be exegetical—the variety of the Biblical pictures for the Atonement; or historical—the limitations of the Anselmic treatment; or theological—God is Love. Whatever the reasons, this criticism serves the helpful purpose of calling the church to re-examine its formula for the Atonement. Does vicarious satisfaction fully express the Biblical doctrine? Does this formula adequately meet the needs of systematic theology today? If not, what should we substitute, or how should we reinterpret?

This study will not present a full discussion of the Biblical doctrine of the Atonement. There are many such available.¹ Nor is it to be a detailed historical

review of the many theories of the Atonement, including Anselm's famous emphasis on satisfaction. There are many such studies.² We shall focus our attention primarily on the use and usefulness of the formula "vicarious satisfaction" in Lutheran theology as an illustration of the function and limitation of ecclesiastical terminology.

For the Lutheran theologian it is not enough to examine this formula on the basis of Biblical word studies, but he must examine it on the basis of Biblical doctrine, which is given its clear and adequate summary in the Lutheran Confessions. In these unique testimonies to the faith once delivered to the saints, hammered out by the Spirit's guidance in the creedal and Reformation periods, there is inescapable evidence that both the language and meaning of later Orthodoxy's *satisfactio vicaria* is used often. This in itself gives any confessionally minded Lutheran pause in being too quick to follow any trends to discard or radically reinterpret the formula.

The crucial *propter Christum* of Augsburg Confession IV is qualified by the reference to the fact that Christ by His

Also Martin Franzmann, "A Ransom for Many," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXV (July 1954), 497—515.

² Cf. Gustav Aulen, *Christus Victor*. American edition (New York: Macmillan, 1951). Also George Evanson, "Critique of *Christus Victor*," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, XXVIII (October 1957), pp. 738—749.

¹ Cf. Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956). Also the critical summary of modern exegetical views in Henry Hamann, *Justification by Faith in Modern Theology* (St. Louis: Concordia Seminary School for Graduate Studies, 1957).

death made satisfaction for our sins.³ The antithesis, to regard "human traditions" as such satisfaction, is condemned as contrary to the Gospel.⁴ Also Luther, in the explanation of the Second Article of the Creed in the Large Catechism, although he uses other vivid terms, teaches that Christ suffered, died, and was buried that He might make satisfaction for me.⁵

Some theologians declare that the Holy Scriptures do not say explicitly that God is reconciled. The Lutheran Confessions, however, do not hesitate to describe the Atonement in this way. The one Christ, true God and true man, is born and truly died that He might reconcile God to us.⁶ Our works do not reconcile God. These follow when we believe that for Christ's sake we are received into grace by the Mediator, through whom the Father is reconciled.⁷ The faith that justifies is the

"special faith" which believes that God is placated and propitiated *propter Christum*.⁸ Very simply and very vividly the Apology affirms that the blood and merits of the Propitiator are the price to reconcile God to us.⁹

Some modern theologians are particularly disturbed by any talk of appeasing the wrath of God or satisfying divine justice. The Lutheran Confessions use both concepts in describing the Atonement. The wrath of God is not appeased if we "set forth our own works."¹⁰ The entire obedience of Christ, says the Formula of Concord, is the most perfect satisfaction and expiation to satisfy immutable divine justice for the human race.¹¹ Christ's obedience, suffering, and resurrection has satisfied the Law for us.¹²

Yet it is surely significant that there is a variety of terminology in the confessions. Satisfaction, a non-Biblical term, lies side

³ "... sed gratis iustificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit." *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952), p. 56. Hereafter this edition of the confessions will be cited as BK.

⁴ "Admonetur etiam, quod traditiones humanae, institutae ad placandum Deum, ad promerendam gratiam et ad satisfaciendum pro peccatis, adversentur evangelio et doctrinae fidei." AC XV 3 in BK, pp. 69 f.

⁵ "... darzu gelidten, gestorben und begraben, dass er fur mich genug tate und bezahlete, was ich verschuldet habe. ..." BK, p. 652.

⁶ "... vere passus, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, ut reconciliaret nobis patrem et hostia esset. ..." AC III, BK, p. 54.

⁷ "... credentes, quod propter Christum recipiamur in gratiam, qui solus positus est mediator et propitiator, per quem reconcilietur pater." AC XX 9; BK, p. 77. Interestingly enough this passage unites the concepts of propitiation and reconciliation.

⁸ "Haec igitur fides specialis, qua credit unusquisque sibi remitti peccata propter Christum, et Deum placatum et propitium esse propter Christum, consequitur remissionem peccatorum et iustificat nos." Ap IV 45; BK, p. 168.

⁹ "... Christi merita sunt pretium, quia oportet esse aliquam certam propitiationem pro peccatis nostris." Ibid., 53; BK, p. 171.

¹⁰ "Ira Dei non potest placari, si opponamus nostra opera, quia Christus propositus est propitiator, ut propter ipsum fiat nobis placatus Pater." Ibid., 80; BK, p. 176.

¹¹ "Weil aber (wie oben vermeldet) der Gehorsamb der ganzen Person ist, so ist er eine vollkommene Genugthuung und Versöhnung des menschlichen Geschlechts, dadurch der ewigen unwandelbaren Gerechtigkeit Gottes, so im Gesetz geoffenbaret genug geschehen und also unser Gerechtigkeit, die für Gott gilt, so im Evangelio geoffenbaret wird. ..." SD III 57; BK, p. 934.

¹² "... die Gerechtigkeit ... ist der Gehorsam, Leiden und Auferstehung Christi, da er für uns dem Gesetz gnuggetan und für unser Sünde bezahlet hat." Ibid., 14; BK, p. 918.

by side with sacrifice, reconciliation, propitiation, and expiation. But it is even more noteworthy to find that all these descriptions of the Atonement are connected to the doctrine of justification by faith. There is no abstract emphasis on the sacrificial work of Christ apart from faith. God is reconciled, but that is to be believed. Readers must be admonished, Melancthon asserts, that it is as necessary to defend the truth that faith justifies as it is to uphold the truth that Christ is Mediator. And how will Christ be the Mediator if you do not "use" Him as Mediator?¹³ Luther similarly points to the fact that although the work is done, if it would remain hidden, it would be in vain.¹⁴ Thus the accent lies not merely upon the satisfactory atonement, or even the faith that justifies, but upon the Spirit's means to faith.

In the Large Catechism Luther has a rich doctrine of the Atonement that includes more than satisfaction language and the cross. The treasure is purchased and won through Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection.¹⁵ It is usual to look almost exclusively to Luther for this victory theme of the Atonement and the correlation of cross and resurrection. But also the Formula of Concord, championing the sole merit and complete obedience of

Christ, joins the suffering and death to the resurrection.¹⁶

Satisfaction language then is commonly used in the Lutheran Confessions, but significantly in great variety, and most significantly in the context of justification by faith and in correlation with the full doctrine that surrounds this *leitmotif* of the confessions. While the term *satisfactio vicaria* is not used as such, the language and meaning of this formula is present.

In the period of Lutheran Orthodoxy the satisfaction emphasis of the symbols becomes even more pronounced. However, both the variety of Scriptural and confessional terms (reconciliation, redemption, sacrifice, propitiation, satisfaction) and the close correlation with justification are continued. As Hoenecke notes, the earlier dogmaticians (Melancthon, Chemnitz, Hutter, Gerhard) treat the priestly work of Christ not as a separate locus but as the *fundamentum iustificationis*. It is only the later dogmaticians (Quenstedt, Calov, Baier, Hollaz) who treat the Atonement as a special section under the *Officium Christi*.¹⁷

John Gerhard, for example, treats the Atonement as one of the causes of justification. Using Aristotelian causality Gerhard begins his *locus* on justification with a beautiful and thorough section on grace as the principle cause of justification. Next, with not even a special title in the text, Gerhard describes the redemption of Christ as the meritorious cause of justification. Obedience is often used as a parallel construction with satisfaction.¹⁸

¹³ "... quod sicut necesse est hanc sententiam tueri, quod Christus sit mediator, ita necesse sit defendere, quod fides iustificet. Quomodo enim erit Christus mediator, si in iustificatione non utimur eo mediatore..." Ap. IV 69; BK, p. 173.

¹⁴ "Das Werk ist geschehen und ausgerichtet; denn Christus hat uns den Schatz erworben und gewonnen durch sein Leiden, Sterben und Auferstehung etc. Aber wenn das Werk verborgen bliebe, dass niemand wüsste, so wäre es ümbsonst und verloren." LC II 3; BK, p. 654.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ SD III 14. Cf. n. 12 above.

¹⁷ Adolf Hoenecke, *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik* (Milwaukee: Northwestern, 1912) III, 198.

¹⁸ John Gerhard, *Loci theologici*, ed. Ed. Preuss (Berlin: G. Schlawitz, 1865), III, 309 ff.

The Law and justice themes of justification bulk very large in the dogmaticians, also the earlier ones. "Since God is a most just Judge" is a recurring theme in Gerhard.¹⁹ God is not only merciful but just. Nevertheless when man's sin had made him subject to the judgment of God, the transfer of our sin to Christ was effected, according to Gerhard, by the immense, ineffable mercy of God.²⁰ The divine glory is at stake, and satisfaction is stressed, but the love of God does not fall away.

This is true even in the later dogmaticians, and in Quenstedt mercy is especially treated at the beginning and end of his section on the priestly office of Christ.²¹ Here also, with the division of Christ's work into *satisfactio* and *intercessio*, there is naturally a stress on satisfaction language.²² There is without doubt the same

¹⁹ "Cum enim Deus sit iudex iustissimus, imo ipsa iustitia, ideo absque interventu plenae ac perfectae satisfactionis propitiatio illa per nudam submissionem vel deprecationem fieri non potuit." Ibid., p. 326.

²⁰ "Deus non solum misericors, sed etiam iustus est. . . ideo postquam homo per praecepti divini transgressionem iudicio Dei ac peccatorum poenis obnoxius erat factus ex immensa et ineffabili Dei misericordia facta est quaedam translatio, ut poenas peccatorum nostrorum Christus in se reciperet, ne divinae veritatis gloria labefactaretur." Ibid., p. 320.

²¹ Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica* (Wittenberg: Johann Ludolph Quenstedt, 1696), Part III, Membrum II "De officio Christi," pp. 212—332. As Quenstedt treats the *finis* of the *satisfactio* proper he says that it demonstrates two things, divine justice and divine mercy. Of the latter he writes ". . . in eo elucet quod Deus Pater Filium suum unigenitum nostri loco in ignominiosissimam mortem tradit, eiusque satisfactionem pro nostra acceptavit, & quod Filius sponte peccata nostra in se suscepit eaque morte sua expiavit." Ibid., 248.

²² "Forma Sacerdotii Christi secundum consilium Dei, constituit in actionibus & passionibus

doctrine of the Atonement, but a narrowing of language may be discernible, and perhaps unfortunately, as mentioned above, the Atonement is somewhat separated from the special unit on justification. These later dogmaticians are more precise, but the unity of the formulation in the doctrine of justification may suffer.

Certainly the formulations of the dogmaticians are based upon careful Biblical study. At the same time polemical emphases are a significant part of the dogmatical treatment. As far as "vicarious satisfaction" is concerned, the Socinians are the primary target. These early Unitarians had taught in the Racovian Catechism that Christ was our Mediator in the sense that God used Him as an intermediary and interpreter over against men as He had used Moses; that the word "redemption" should be understood metaphorically as a general deliverance without the intervention of any price of satisfaction; that ἱλασμός (1 John 2:2) means expiation and not any satisfaction to divine justice, etc.²³

Most of Gerhard's specific discussion of the Atonement (and very much that of the later dogmaticians who treat the errors

satisfactoriis, seu expiatoriis peccatorum nostrorum, & meritoriis, felicitatis nostrae, h. e., in legis perfecta impletionem, pro peccatis nostris satisfactione, & intercessionem tum generali, pro omnibus hominibus, tum speciali pro electis." Ibid., p. 222.

²³ Also that reconciliation implies not man to God but man with man; that λύτρον and ἀντὶ λύτρον must be understood metaphorically of sin and death rather than as a true price by which captives are freed; that Christ did not die for us in our place, nor was the shedding of His blood in the place of our satisfaction, but that His death for us and His blood establishes the way of salvation. Cf. Gerhard, pp. 320—336 *passim*.

also
revoc
It w
doxy
satis
judg
the
meta
conc
argu
justi
"sati

If
form
men
of th
the
abun
may
ficial
polar
Vica
Bibli
thera

Th
feren
Ame
satis
thera
doxy
insis
satis
press
reden
Piep
phase

24
the
Coun
to 17
25
(St. L
II, 34

also of the Romanists, Calvinists, etc.) revolves around an anti-Socinian polemic. It would surely be fair to say that Orthodoxy's particular emphasis on "vicarious satisfaction," as well as the emphatic judgment that the redemption words of the New Testament are not to be taken metaphorically, is a strongly polemically conditioned emphasis and judgment. The argument over the satisfaction of God's justice may help to emphasize the word "satisfaction" with its legal concepts.

If we could speak of loss in Orthodoxy's formulation of the doctrine of the Atonement, it would be partly in the removal of the *locus* on the work of Christ from the *locus* on justification, partly in the abundant use of scholastic categories which may tend to give the discussion an artificial quality, and partly in an overly polemical coloring given to satisfaction. Vicarious satisfaction became not only a Biblical but a polemical slogan for Lutheran Orthodoxy.

The dogmatists of the Synodical Conference are not alone among Lutherans in America in emphasizing the vicarious satisfaction in the tradition of the Lutheran Confessions and Lutheran Orthodoxy.²⁴ But Francis Pieper is particularly insistent that the expression "vicarious satisfaction . . . fully and adequately expresses what Scripture teaches on the redemption which Christ procured."²⁵ Pieper finds three major Scriptural emphases in this formula: (1) The immutable

justice of God demands perfect obedience to God's Law; (2) Christ willingly accepted the obligation to keep the Law and bear the punishment the Law exacts of transgressors; (3) Through Christ's substitutional obedience and death God's wrath against men was appeased.²⁶

Once again, as in Orthodoxy, the Scripturally based polemic, this time against the 19th-century views of the Atonement (especially Ritschl and Bushnell), may account for the insistence on satisfaction language. Against all modern theories that make human renewal and sanctification factors in the work of atonement, Pieper holds that the process of atonement and justification (objective justification is treated here) is juridical through and through.²⁷ Nevertheless Pieper also insists that the death of Christ reveals both God's wrath and God's love.²⁸

Adolph Hoenecke of the Wisconsin Synod, an older contemporary of Pieper, quotes the old dogmatists at length. Yet on three points he concedes that one must be careful in using the formula "vicarious satisfaction." The necessity of satisfaction is not absolute, according to Hoenecke. God was not compelled. Rather we must think of necessity in terms of the free mercy of God.²⁹ Secondly, he criticizes Quenstedt for holding that God is the reconciled object of *ἰλασμενθαί*. This

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 344—347.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 354 ff.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 353.

²⁹ Hoenecke, p. 201. "Anmerkung: — Wir handeln jetzt von der *necessitas satisfactionis*. Wir nehmen selbstverstaendlich keine *absolute necessitas* an; denn das hiesse behaupten, dass Gott gezwungen war, durch eine veranstaltete *satisfactio* die Suender zu retten. Wir reden von der Notwendigkeit unter Voraussetzung des freien Erbarmens Gottes."

²⁴ Cf. Henry Eyster Jacobs, *A Summary of the Christian Faith* (Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1907), pp. 167 to 179.

²⁵ Francis Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951) II, 344.

usage, Hoenecke points out, is found in heathen literature. Christian revelation teaches a God who from eternity is favorably minded in mercy. An atonement of guilt did not have to take place before God could first be merciful.³⁰ Finally, Hoenecke insists that the universal reconciliation through Christ cannot be understood as a change in God's attitude toward the world, but as a change in the relationship between God and the world.³¹ Nevertheless the complete satisfaction through Christ's life and death for the sins of the world is clearly and vigorously upheld. Obedience, as in Orthodoxy and in Pieper, too, is often substituted for satisfaction.

Certainly "vicarious satisfaction" is still a valuable formula 50 years later against

³⁰ Ibid., p. 193. "Der eigentlich biblische Sprachgebrauch ist es nicht, dass Gott das zu versöhnende Objekt von ἰλασθῆναι ist. Aber die griechische Profanliteratur hat es so. Das ist erklärlich. Das Heidentum kennt nur einen Gott, der erst günstig gestimmt werden muss, den unwürdigen Menschen Gutes zuzuwenden. Die christliche Offenbarung lehrt einen Gott, der schon von Ewigkeit in Erbarmen günstig gesinnt ist, und nicht eine Sühnung der Schuld veranstaltet, damit er erst gnädig werde, sondern damit die Sünde bedeckt und seine Gerechtigkeit nicht gezwungen werde, den verdienten Zorn walten zu lassen, und er vielmehr seinem ewigen Erbarmen freien Lauf lassen könne." Cf. Morris' verdict: "It is of the utmost importance that we should understand that propitiation in the crude sense is not possible with the God of Israel . . ." (p. 155). Morris' entire treatment of ἰλασθῆναι bears this out. Cf. pp. 125—160.

³¹ Ibid., p. 191. "Jetzt fragt sich, ob die Versöhnung, in welcher Gott die Welt mit sich versöhnt, in einer Änderung des Gemüts Gottes gegenüber der Welt besteht? Die Antwort lautet: Nein!" Cf. Morris' approving quotation of P. T. Forsyth's distinction: "God's feeling toward us never needed to be changed. But God's treatment of us, God's practical relation to us — that had to change." (P. 220)

any continuation of the old subjective theories of the Atonement. There are still those who minimize the full force of the wrath of God that hangs heavy over man's sin. There are those who minimize the reality of substitution. The polemical background of the formula in the history of Lutheran theology shows that this is still a useful defensive and protective weapon against these errors. Here in a concise formula we can affirm with the Lutheran fathers that God's wrath, His holy justice, is a real threat for sinful man, and that Christ really "went under" that wrath, that holy justice, for us.

At the same time the church's formulations must clearly say what we do not mean, or at least we must guard them from being interpreted falsely. In this respect, Hoenecke apparently is more explicit than Pieper in calling attention to possible dangers of misunderstanding the term "vicarious satisfaction." In addition to those cited by Hoenecke, others deserve mention. This terminology with its emphasis on justice satisfied could be used to lead to the wrong conclusion that the Atonement is primarily the Law of God at work and not the Gospel.³² This terminology, with a concentration on Calvary, could be used to isolate the cross from the total Atonement in the life and the resurrection of the God-man. Vicarious satisfaction could also be made to play a role in the dangerous separation of justification from God's intended goal in sanctification. In the necessary polemical denial of subjective theories of the Atonement the church must say more than no. She must

³² "While wrath is a dreadful reality, it must not be taken as the last word about God." Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

use her formulae also positively to set forth the whole doctrine of God!

Some limitations in the use of this formula are apparent when the church's main kerygmatic task is considered. Granted that the kerygma cannot be separated from a valid polemic, the preacher will not emphasize merely God's justice, Christ as man's Substitute, the reality of the Atonement, but he will proclaim the good news that here is justice and love, that love truly has conquered justice, that Christ is *God's* Substitute and not only man's, and that this substitutionary love has effects for life and for the judgment of wrath on the Last Day. It may be questioned whether any one formula can bear the burden of this kerygma in its entirety.

Finally, when the systematician and the preacher look to the Biblical doctrine of the Atonement, the limitations of "vicarious satisfaction" as an all-inclusive formula are apparent. Propitiation, to be sure, is what the Holy Scriptures say. But these inspired records of the Spirit also describe the Atonement as revelation, reconciliation, restoration, sacrifice, and ransom. The first and last of these Biblical pictures have frightened many theologians because of what the modern period has done with revelation or because of what some of the early fathers did with ransom. Can "vicarious satisfaction" embrace this Biblical variety of graphic description?

It may be argued that these are not mere metaphorical descriptions of the Atonement. But neither are they photographs which can be laid one upon the other so that the church has one absolutely unalterable facsimile of what the death of Christ meant to the early church or should mean to us. Perhaps some modern Biblical

scholars go too far in stressing the variety of the pictures or the relativity of the pictures of the Atonement. With Orthodoxy against the Socinians we can say: These are not metaphors, as the Socinians understood metaphor. But it would surely be dangerous to say: These are not metaphors in any sense at all.³³ Not only has "vicarious satisfaction" at times been used to say this, but the actual reality in the unified but varied Biblical teaching has conceivably been narrowed into the frame of this one non-Biblical metaphor of satisfaction, even though based directly on the Biblical concepts of propitiation and justification.

But there is also a danger in discarding the churchly formula of vicarious satisfaction. A preacher's mind can run riot in Atonement imagery. One describes God spanking His Son in the hot anger of His love. Another has God frying His Son for us. We can think of Luther here.³⁴ Surely such imagery, even when it is non-Biblical, may be useful. But the danger is that the preciseness which even preaching needs is lost. Reveling in variety and multiplicity of imagery, the preacher attempts no systematization — even as the preliminary "boards" for his preaching.

Another danger comes from the well-

³³ Morris does not hesitate to use the word "metaphor." Note this sentence from his conclusion. "But these studies are in the nature of a preliminary approach wherein we have cleared some of the ground, and begun to appreciate some of the metaphors which the men of New Testament days found helpful when they wished to draw attention to one aspect or another of a divine action they found it impossible to describe fully." *Op. cit.*, p. 275.

³⁴ Cf. v. 3 of his famous Easter hymn which describes Christ "in heisser Lieb gebraten." The altered translation of Richard Massie (*Lutheran Hymnal*, 195:3) is quite different. "So strong His love."

meaning Biblical man who insists that churchly forms be couched only in the language of Scripture. Satisfaction is not Biblical, and hence out it goes — together with Trinity, person, essence. "Fried in hot love" is not Scriptural. Hence out that goes, even if it is Martin Luther. On the contrary, we must insist that neither the formulation nor the preaching can restrict itself to the Bible's words and pictures. But both the formulation and the preaching that ought to grow out of it must continually be based upon, and refreshed by, not only the Biblical doctrine in its living truth but also by the Biblical language.

"Vicarious satisfaction" may involve questions from kerygmatic and exegetical standpoints. But the formula is still useful and valuable. The fathers of the Reformation, of Orthodoxy, of the 19th-century confessional revival used "vicarious atonement" valiantly, and so can we in 20th-century polemics. But we cannot expect too much of this formula. We cannot be blind to its limitations or the necessity of continually surrounding this formula with the full Gospel, with the whole truth, the varied truth of the Scriptures.

No formulation can itself insure the proper distinction between Law and Gospel and the primacy and transcendence of the Gospel. There must be clarity, correctness, polemical precision, in rejecting errors to the right and to the left, but unless the use of the formulation in teaching and preaching is in the context of the Gospel of God's forgiveness so that the sinner hears above all this news: Christ died for me and my sins, the correct form will remain that — only a form, and

it may even become an idol, a hindrance to the Gospel.

This is not to drive a wedge between dogma and kerygma, between dogmatics and preaching. It is to assert that important as true doctrinal formulations are, their meaning and use are much more important. And true orthodoxy lies not merely in the former but most truly in the latter.

Charity requires that we examine the reason why some have departed from the "time-honored" terminology. We should be willing at all times to subject formulations, even "vicarious satisfaction," to a constructive Biblical and historic criticism. The same charity is due the fathers who found in a formula like *satisfactio vicaria* a complete and fully adequate statement of Scripture on redemption. We must ask: What did they mean? What do we mean? Ultimately what do the Scriptures and our confessions mean?

In this analysis of churchly formulations like "vicarious satisfaction," the Lutheran Confessions are a norm for Lutheran theology. They are, in our conviction, the "summarischer Begriff" of Biblical doctrine. But we are not concerned merely with the words or external forms but with the meaning. Granted, at least according to Aristotelian thought, that meaning is never apart from words, yet modern Lutherans too should say: Meanings are more important than words.

We should therefore contend for the *doctrine* of the vicarious satisfaction rather than merely for any doctrinal slogan. And most of all we should be concerned how this doctrine of the Gospel — for that is what it is, that is what is at stake — is used in preaching and teaching. This is

the task of the church, not only Biblical study, not only orthodox doctrinal formulations, but preaching. *Das Wort muss geschrieben werden*. And for the sake of that task we exegize and formulate.

In the light of a study like this one, systematic theology is a very humble work. It analyzes, criticizes, evaluates, formulates, codifies, synthesizes, capsules for the sake of the Gospel. And sometimes, perhaps more often than most systematizers would like to admit, the formulations are weak. They overemphasize or underemphasize. And so the work must still be done and done again — all for the sake of the Gospel.

For the Gospel's sake the old Lutheran dogmatists capsuled and defended God's work in Christ under this theological shorthand symbol *satisfactio vicaria*. For the sake of the Gospel we translate this not only into English but into the best possible "slogan" for our needs. Possibly the best is a transliteration: "vicarious satisfaction." Probably better is substitutionary satisfaction. Even better — substitutional atonement (to give scope to the Biblical variety). A longer paraphrase would be: God's substitutional atonement (or reconciliation) in Christ. Note what

has happened. *Vicaria* is unchanged (although substitutionary is still a barbarous Latinism). *Satisfactio* has become reconciliation. What are the advantages? The formula is more immediately Biblical and just as concrete. What are the disadvantages? The formula is far less concise.

And here is the perennial problem in churchly formulations. The glory of systematic theology, its main task, is precision and clarity in doctrinal formulation. Yet this becomes also the inescapable weakness, a weakness that is uncovered afresh by every Biblical exegete and preacher.

Nevertheless — the bold word of the systematician for the Gospel's sake — we must capsule even as the fathers did. Their capsule is still good in spite of any criticism. But we will attempt to make it the best possible, always remembering that all our formulas, theirs or ours, are limited, that is to say, not perfect or unalterable. The doctrine is forever true. It's *done* in the action of God and *written* in the inspired Scriptures. But the formulations only relatively share that finality and that truth. They are not done. Not even "vicarious satisfaction."

St. Louis, Mo.

The Vicarious Atonement in John Quenstedt

By ROBERT D. PREUS

The last decades have witnessed some significant and provocative studies in the doctrine of the Atonement. Two of these studies particularly have stimulated interest by the way in which they have broken with the old Lutheran and Protestant treatment of the doctrine while attempting at the same time to be entirely Biblical in the approach and presentation of the doctrine. On the one hand, Gustaf Aulén classifies the post-Reformation teaching as only a slight and more logical modification of the doctrine of Anselm, a teaching dominated by the idea of satisfaction and the legal motif. In contrast to this, Aulén offers his well-known "classic idea" with its victory motif, and identifies this with Luther's teaching.^{1a} Barth, on the other hand, primarily in Vol. IV, 1 of his *Church Dogmatics*, deals with the Atonement as a part of his discussion on justification and reconciliation. He feels that the forensic image so common in Scripture is the best point of departure in setting forth the doctrine of the Atonement and is to be preferred to the way in which Orthodoxy considered the matter, viz., under the locus on the sacerdotal office of Christ. Barth makes no sweeping criticism of the method and manner in which Orthodoxy treated this doctrine, although he cannot agree always with the conclusions of the older orthodox theologians. Barth, then, is much closer to the older doctrine than Aulén and seems to

have read the Reformed and Lutheran dogmaticians with more appreciation and understanding than Aulén — in fact, he often draws upon their arguments.

Because of the rather frequent reference to the old classical Lutheran doctrine of the Atonement and the rather scanty firsthand knowledge of this doctrine, and also because of the new approaches made to this doctrine in recent times, I have attempted here to clear the air, so to speak, to establish so far as possible in an article of this nature what Orthodoxy actually taught on this matter. It is my opinion that if we can overcome our antipathy to some of their scholastic terminology and the rather schematic order of their material, we shall discover that the old Lutheran theologians offer something which is remarkably well balanced and solidly Scriptural.

We might comment on Aulén's charge that Orthodoxy's doctrine of the atonement was one-sided. Quenstedt has discussed the object for which Christ's satisfaction was made under five points: (a) sin, (b) punishment for sin, (c) the curse of the Law, (d) the power of the devil, (e) death. All of these *obiecta* are somehow related to the idea of satisfaction according to this treatment, although in the last two cases the concept of satisfaction is not allowed to color or even enter into his exegeses so as to vitiate the thought and image of Scripture. The victory motif which Aulén finds in Scripture was not neglected or toned down by Orthodoxy, but was clearly set forth and given its place along with the other themes which Scripture uses in

^{1a} G. Aulén, *Christus Victor* (New York, 1931), pp. 142 ff. R. Prenter, *Skabelse og Genløsning* (København, 1955), p. 448, seems to follow Aulén in his judgment of orthodoxy.

speaking of the work of Christ. On the other hand, it is clear that Quenstedt has offered far more than merely a logical modification of the legal satisfaction motif of Anselm, as Aulén charges. Barth^{1b} is more Biblical than Aulén when he admits that he prefers the forensic image in setting forth the doctrine of Christ's work but that the ransom picture or victory motif might also be used as the point of departure in treating Christ's work. However, the procedure of older Lutheran dogmatics would seem to be far preferable when they dealt with the work of Jesus Christ under the title *Munus Christi sacerdotale*, for the Bible points more often to this "cultic" picture in speaking of the work of Christ. Barth says he prefers his forensic point of departure to the cultic, because the latter is not so meaningful today. We would probably disagree with Barth's choice and say rather that it must be our purpose as theologians to make Christ's high-priestly office meaningful also today. But at the same time we will grant that the forensic figure would not be the most unfortunate starting point in dealing with this doctrine. At any rate we can learn one thing from studying Quenstedt: he draws in every Scripture image which will help him to set forth the doctrine of the vicarious atonement. His treatment is well balanced and not dominated by a legal motif or any other. It is Aulén's doctrine which is one-sided, with its exclusive emphasis on the victory theme.

This study of a typical Orthodox Lutheran discussion of the doctrine of the vicarious atonement will, I hope, serve to show us two things: first, how much we

today owe to the orthodox Lutheran theologians for the theology which has been handed down to us, and second, how we can still learn from their careful, Scriptural treatment of all doctrine.

In this delineation I shall restrict myself to the presentation by John A. Quenstedt (1617—88). This, I believe, is fair and adequate inasmuch as Quenstedt was the Thomas Aquinas, so to speak, of Lutheran Orthodoxy, the last great representative. To anyone following his arrangement of material and noting his exegesis it will become evident that he was fair and meticulous in his work and drew from the best which his precursors had to offer. The strong exegetical basis for his entire treatment will be noticeable throughout. Quenstedt's systematic section on the Atonement actually presents nothing but exegesis of passages pertaining to the doctrine, arranged according to a quite skeletal scholastic outline.^{1c} The reader will notice, too, how very closely Quenstedt's terminology and understanding of this great doctrine approximate what has always been believed and taught concerning the vicarious atonement within conservative Lutheranism. This fact alone makes a study like the following relevant and useful today.

1. Like the other Lutheran and Reformed theologians Quenstedt offers his treatment of the vicarious atonement within his discussion of the priestly office of Christ. His thesis is simple and straightforward:

The priestly office is a work of the God-man; accordingly Christ by the eternal

^{1b} *Church Dogmatics* (Edinburgh, 1956), IV, 1, pp. 273 ff.

^{1c} The present study is based entirely on Quenstedt's *Theologia didactico-polemica sive systema theologicum*, 1685, Part Three, Cap. III, Membrum II, "De officio Christi," Sec. 1, Th. 14 to 44.

counsel of God and by His own voluntary decision placed Himself in time under God's Law and did so on our behalf and in our stead. And by fulfilling that Law perfectly and by suffering all punishment He presented an obedience to divine righteousness which was sufficient to the last ounce (*ex asse*) and also freed us from the wrath of God, the curse of the Law, from sin and all evil. This obedience He now offers God the Father, and by His intercession He obtains everything good and needful for us. (Thesis 14)

We see from this statement that the priestly office of Christ is divided into two parts: satisfaction and intercession. We shall review only Quenstedt's treatment of the former.

Quenstedt begins his discussion by pointing out that the term *satisfactio* was not found in the Vulgate. However, the idea of satisfaction is expressed by many images of Scripture: (a) Restoration. Ps. 69:4: "Then I restored that which I took not away"; (b) λύτρον, Matt. 20:28; (c) ἀντίλυτρον, 1 Tim. 2:6; (d) Propitiation, 1 John 2:2; 4:10; (e) ἱλαστήριον, Rom. 3:24, 25; (f) Reconciliation, Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18ff.; (g) ἀπολύτρωσις, Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; (h) λύτρωσις, 1 Peter 1:18; (i) ἀγόρας, 1 Cor. 6:20, "Ye are bought with a price"; (j) ἐξαγόρας, Gal. 3:13. Also other terms are used in Scripture, such as oblation, expiation, sacrifice for sins, etc.

The satisfaction and the merit of Christ are not to be taken as equivalents. There are a number of differences in the two concepts.

a. Satisfaction compensates for a wrong (*iniuria*) against God, it makes expiation (*expiat*) for sin, it pays a debt and frees fully from eternal punishment. Merit, on the other hand, restores us into a state of

divine favor, it gains for us a reward of grace (the grace of forgiven sins), it acquires justification and eternal life for sinners.

b. Satisfaction is a cause; merit an effect. Merit arises out of satisfaction. "Christ made satisfaction for our sins and for the punishment of sins, and thus He merited for us the grace of God, forgiveness of sins, and eternal life."

c. Satisfaction is something which has been rendered to the Triune God, not to us, although it was made *for us*. Christ, however, did not merit anything for the Triune God, but for us.

d. The humiliation of Christ, His obedience under the Law, His suffering and death, are both satisfaction and meritorious. The exaltation, resurrection, ascension, and session at the right hand of God are not works of satisfaction, but they are meritorious, thereby assuring our resurrection and reserving a place in heaven for us.

e. Satisfaction arose because a debt had to be paid (*satisfactio ex debito oritur*), but merit is not something owed, it is free. Quenstedt remarks that not all theologians observe these distinctions, but many speak of merit in a broad sense as embracing also the idea of satisfaction.

2. The One who made the satisfaction (*principium quod satisfactionis*) is Christ, the God-man. To illustrate this, Quenstedt considers two Scripture passages in great detail. (a) Is. 63:3: "I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with Me." Here is a reference to the Messiah, who comes with red garments from Bozrah, who speaks righteousness and is mighty to save. This Savior treads the winepress alone. He conquers

the enemies, Satan, death, and sin, treads them underfoot, and gains complete victory. But not without wounds. He suffers and dies to gain the victory. (b) 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6. Just as there is only one God among all false gods, so there is only one Mediator. A mediator is one who intervenes or intercedes. He also may be one who placates another and brings peace where there was formerly wrath between two hostile parties. A μεσίτης is never one who merely reveals and interprets another's will (Socinus). Jesus is a Mediator of a new covenant by reason of the shedding of His blood in redemption. (Heb. 12:24)

This Mediator is described in the above passage (a) according to His personal majesty.

He is called man, but not an ordinary man or merely a man. The Mediator is One who, although He was God, was made man that He might fulfill the office of a mediator. Therefore the term man in this passage is not a person in the abstract, or what would be the same thing, the human nature in the concrete, but it is the entire person in the concrete, although only one nature, namely, the human, is referred to. This is seen from the fact that (1) this man is immediately called Jesus Christ and this name points to the entire unity of the Person, and that (2) this man is the One who gave Himself a ransom for all, v. 6. Now this is no mere man, but θεάνθρωπος, the God-man, for no mere man was able to effect such a redemption (Ps. 49:7). Therefore this man is clearly a singular man, who in the unity of His person is God and the Lord God (2 Sam. 7:19) . . . who is over all, God blessed forever (Rom. 9:5). . . . The apostle calls our Mediator in this verse man and not God because (1) it was for the sake of the mediatorial office that He

was made man, and (2) we then might come to this Mediator with greater confidence and flee to Him, as men to a man and brothers to a brother. (Thesis 2B, Obs. 3)

The Mediator is described in this passage (b) according to the dignity of His office. He is called Christ, the Anointed One, who according to His human nature was anointed with the infinite glory of the Holy Spirit. He is called Jesus, Savior, because that is the purpose of His office as Mediator, to save His people from their sins. (Matt. 1:21)

The satisfaction is accomplished by Christ with the participation of both the human and the divine nature, the divine as source and formally (*originaliter et formaliter*) and the human nature as a means (*organice*) by virtue of its personal union with the divine nature.

Note: The suffering and death of only the flesh of Christ could not free us from sin, from the wrath of God and the curse of the Law, and from eternal perdition, nor could it render an adequate price for redeeming the human race. No, the satisfaction for the sin of the entire world, the propitiation of divine wrath, the bruising of the serpent's head, the performing of perfect righteousness, required a divine and infinite power. Therefore the divine nature fortified the suffering flesh so that it did not sink under these sufferings, and it procured for these sufferings and death infinite effectiveness. (Thesis 29)

3. Quenstedt strongly insists that only the Triune God is the indirect object of the satisfaction. Against Him we have sinned (Ps. 51:4). Therefore the ransom and satisfaction must be made to Him.

The One to whom the satisfaction was made (*objectum cui*) was exclusively the

Triune God. The entire Trinity was offended with sin and angry with men; and because of the immutability of God's justice and the holiness of His nature and the truth of His threatenings, He could not remit sins without punishment (*impune*), nor can He receive men into grace without satisfaction. Therefore the human race was reconciled to the whole Trinity through Christ. And that old cuckoo-cry that no one can offer satisfaction to himself or mediate in respect to himself does not hold true. If the Father King is offended, the Son is offended, too; but nothing prevents the Son from procuring mercy for the one who is accused of the Father. Thus 2 Cor. 5:19 says: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself," and in Rom. 5:10 we are said to be "reconciled to God through the death of His Son." (Thesis 30)

Quenstedt goes on to insist that there is nothing wrong according to 2 Cor. 5:19 with saying that Christ reconciled the world unto Himself, inasmuch as He is God, the subject of the action in the verse. Thus in this transaction God is the injured party and the party who is placating. He makes satisfaction to Himself as the injured party (*satisfecit sibi ipsi ut offenso*).

Quenstedt says that Rom. 5:10 teaches such a full reconciliation. Grotius had entertained the idea that the reconciliation was conditional, depending upon our accepting it all in faith. Quenstedt argues that our appropriating to ourselves God's deed is not the completion of the deed itself. The reconciliation through the death of the Son was accomplished *plene, imo plenissime*. "We were not redeemed or reconciled nor were our sins paid for in any way conditionally, but we were reconciled completely and perfectly and fully." This applies both to the actual carrying out of the reconciliation and to our appro-

priating it by faith. For faith is nothing else than accepting the finished reconciliation.

When we discuss reconciliation and satisfaction, we must bear in mind that God is a just Judge who demands satisfaction for every infraction of His Law. That God is a righteous God and deals with sin according to righteousness is brought out clearly in Rom. 3:25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare *His righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past." Here it is indicated that punishment for sin is necessary, either upon the guilty, namely, sinful man, or upon his surety (*vas*), Christ. "If God had been able to overlook man's transgression without satisfaction and without compromising His infinite righteousness, so great a sacrifice on the part of the only-begotten Son would not have been necessary. God, who is infinite, was offended by sin, and because sin is an offense and outrage and profaning of the most high God (I might call it decide), it carries with it a kind of infinite wickedness . . . and deserves infinite punishment; and therefore it required the price of satisfaction which only Christ could pay." (Thesis 31)

Quenstedt insists against the Socinians that God must not be thought of merely as a private creditor (*creditor privatus*) but as a just Judge (*creditor publicus iudicarius*) who cannot let sin go unpunished without violating His own righteousness. According to 2 Tim. 2:13, God cannot deny Himself, that is, He cannot go back on His Word of promise or of threat. Sin is not something with which the one sinned against can do as he pleases, but sin is always in reference to God's righteousness,

which cannot
eously
God H
could
Quens
of such
flicts
who c
with t
that h
the kn
the ho
and ca
ment.

4. T
reale
sin, a
which
even t
is sho
borne
. . . E
gression
1 Peter
In the
idea o
of this
sorrow
of the
that is
ishmer
is clea
paralle
"His
body.
means
miseri
tando
taueri

2 T
III, qu

which is of His very essence, and God cannot connive against His own righteousness. Certain scholastics had said that God by an absolute decree of His power could remit sin without any satisfaction.² Quenstedt claims that it is wrong to speak of such absolute power in God, for it conflicts (a) with the very nature of God, who cannot be not angry against sin, (b) with the integrity of God, who told Adam that he would die if he ate from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, (c) with the holiness of God, which is unchangeable and cannot remit any sin without punishment.

4. The real object for which (*objectum reale pro quo*) Christ made satisfaction is sin, all sin, original and actual, all sin which ever has or ever will be committed, even the sin against the Holy Ghost. This is shown in Is. 53:4 ff. "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. . . . But He was wounded for our transgressions, etc." (Cf. Matt. 8:17; Acts 8:32; 1 Peter 2:24, where the same fact is taught.) In the NT βαστάζειν expresses the same idea of Christ carrying our sin. The object of this bearing and carrying are griefs and sorrows, which are to be taken as disorders of the soul, spiritual griefs and sorrows, that is, sins which are the cause of all punishment and of all sorrow and grief. This is clear from the context (v. 6) and from parallel references such as 1 Peter 2:24: "His own self bare our sins in His own body. . . ." That Christ carried our sins means that indirectly He carried also the miseries and sicknesses of our bodies (*portando peccata Christus etiam morbos portaverit*); and thus we have healing and for-

giveness. Commenting on Is. 53:8b: "For the transgression of My people was He stricken," Quenstedt says,

Our sins deserve wounds, our transgressions bruises, our iniquities stripes. But we were unable by suffering these wounds and bruises and stripes to free ourselves from sins and transgressions and to heal ourselves from iniquities. In such a manner there could be no satisfaction made to divine righteousness so that we should be whole and well. Therefore by a judicial imputation the Lord made the sins of all fall upon the Messiah: like a storm they would carry Messiah away, like an army they would destroy Him (וְהַמָּשִׁיחַ, v. 6, means to meet, to run against, to make an impact upon someone, to wield a sword. See Judg. 8:21; 15:12). Christ voluntarily bore that load of sin, the wounds, the bruises, the stripes; and thus He made satisfaction to God for us. (Thesis 33)

This is just a portion of Quenstedt's long discussion of the important Is. 53 passage.

The second passage for consideration is Titus 2:14: "Who gave Himself for us, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας." The δόσις points to Christ's giving Himself over to suffering and death, although He was delivered by other persons, viz., Judas (Matt. 26:15), the high priests (Matt. 27:2, 18), Satan (John 13:2), Pilate (Matt. 27:26), and also the Father (Rom. 8:32) out of His great love for mankind. These words "who gave Himself" (also Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Eph. 5:2) point to Christ's free and willing oblation unto the death of the cross, an oblation performed out of the most ardent love toward us. And so He gave willingly, not because He was forced; but He was moved only by His love for us, moved to give not gold or silver or animals, not another man

² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, Part III, qu. 46, art. 2.

or even all angels, but Himself (ἐαυτόν). Elsewhere He is said to give His flesh (John 6:51), His body (Luke 22:19), His blood (Luke 22:20), His life (Matt. 20:28). All this means that the whole Christ was given, not merely His body or merely His soul, but Himself, God and man.

Speaking next about the redemption which is expressed here, Quenstedt mentions that the redemption should be considered qualitatively and quantitatively. Taken *qualitatively*, Christ's redemption is a true and proper and satisfactory redemption and must not be regarded as something metaphorical (Socinus). When the apostle uses the term λυτροῦν, he is not signifying merely a liberation, but a real redemption and satisfaction, which was made with an adequate ransom (*interventu* ἰσορροπίου λύτρου καὶ ἀντιλύτρου), 1 Tim. 2:6. It is true that the term redemption can be taken broadly as a mere freeing without any price, but in the present context and in other similar contexts there can be no doubt as to its meaning (cf. Matt. 20:28; 1 Peter 1:19, where the price is mentioned). Taken *quantitatively*, the redemption of Christ may be considered in respect to the *subjects* involved, namely, all sinners ("that He might redeem us"), or in respect to the *object* involved, namely, that from which all sinners are redeemed, i.e., "all iniquity." "All iniquity" means that there is no sin which is not covered by Christ's expiation.

The last passage to be discussed under the first *objectum reale pro quo satisfactum* is 1 John 1:7: "The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας." It must first be noted that this blood is precious, because it is the blood of God's

Son (τοῦ υἱοῦ, 1 Peter 1:19 and Acts 20:28). To Him nothing can be compared in heaven or earth; therefore the ransom which is His life has infinite value before God, and we have τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, and we have reconciliation as well through His blood (Eph. 1:8; Col. 1:20). Secondly, this verse indicates the efficacy of Christ's blood to cleanse us from sin. Here we learn that Christ did not shed His blood merely to declare and show that God would cleanse us from all our sins, but Christ's blood cleanses us really (ὄντως). The work of cleansing is attributed to His blood. "The blood of Christ all by itself (*immediate*) produces and brings about this effect, viz., καθαρισμόν, cleansing, propitiation from sins." The Son of God is said to have washed us from our sins in His own blood (Rev. 1:5). [Cf. also Heb. 1:3: "Christ purged our sins," where the same *objectum reale* of the atonement is pointed to]

The second *objectum reale pro quo* of the vicarious atonement is the punishment for sin, both temporal and eternal. Christ made satisfaction for all the punishment which men deserved on account of sin, and that by enduring these punishments Himself. Again Is. 53:5 is cited. The מִן־כָּל is the guilt and blame against which punishment is brought. The punishment which was essential for our peace and our good was endured by Him. The peace here means *bonum impunitatis, pacificatio*, reconciliation with God (Rom. 5:9 ff.). "The punishment for our sins in Christ brought to us and acquired for us impunity, peace, and reconciliation with God."

More specifically the Scriptures speak first of God's wrath, as that for which atonement was made, for it is the wrath which

brings the punishment which is the sinner's due. Rom. 5:9 makes it clear that the suffering and death of Christ are a ransom by which the wrath of God is appeased and by which we are reconciled to God. The fact that Paul says in the next verse that we shall be saved by Christ's life, i. e., His resurrection, should present no difficulty. "Salvation from wrath is attributed to the death of Christ *respectu acquisitionis*, it is referred to the resurrection and life of Christ *respectu manifestationis, applicationis, confirmationis et actualis a peccato absolutiois*" (Thesis 34, β, Obs.). The wrath is eschatological (σωθησόμεθα cf. 1 Thess. 1:10: "from the wrath to come"). Quenstedt quotes Augustine: "God's wrath is not a disturbance (*perturbatio*) of His mind, but is His righteous decision to punish sin" (*De civitate Dei*, Book XV, c. 25).

The next specific *objectum reale pro quo satisfactum* is the curse of the Law. According to Gal. 3:13 and its immediate context we learn that all men are under the Law and obligated to obey it. But because of the sin clinging to us we cannot do this. Therefore we are under the curse (v. 10). But Christ redeemed all who were under this curse (cf. 4:5). The evil from which Christ redeemed us the apostle calls *κατάρα τοῦ νόμου*. This is much more than only saying that we were redeemed from the Law. The curse of the Law is the sentence of the divine Law, the damning sentence which metes out punishment against sin. This punishment is not only temporal but eternal. It was under such a sentence that we placed ourselves by our violation of God's Law (v. 10). The means by which we were freed from this curse the apostle first mentions in a general way

when he says ἐξηγόρασεν. The word means to buy back or redeem, and always denotes an acquisition which is bought with a price (2 Peter 2:1). The prefixed word (ἐξηγόρασεν), which Paul does not ordinarily use in similar contexts, is employed here to indicate the depth of misery from which Christ redeemed us and the firm and complete nature (*soliditas*) of His redemption (cf. Zech. 9:11). The apostle then proceeds to recount more explicitly the means by which we were redeemed from the curse. This he does with the words γεγόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. The intensity of the noun is brought out by the composite ἐπικατάρατος which immediately follows. He who is cursed is detestable, abominable, hateful, damnable, in the eyes of God. And Christ is not simply called cursed but a curse, which means an outcast (κάθαρμα), *fex, excrementum*, destruction, filth, offscouring (1 Cor. 4:13; Gal. 1:8). The noun is used for emphasis, as when we call an infamous person (*sceleratus*) wickedness (*scelus*).³ Christ was made a curse, the curse of all curses descended upon Him. This thought must not be glossed over; just as the Word was made (ἐγένετο) flesh and made (γενόμενον) of a woman, He was truly made (γενόμενος) a curse, and that according to "the judgment of God which is according to truth" (Rom. 2:2). Against all who would take away the force of this statement the words of Chrysostom apply (*Hom. 10 in Job.*), "When Christ took on flesh for us, He took on the curse for us." The words of Augustine are also pertinent (*Con. Fau-*

³ Cf. Luther, WA, 40¹, 449: "Non solum igitur fuit Maledictus, sed factus est pro nobis Maledictum. Hoc vere est interpretari apostolice Scripturas. Nam homo sine Spiritu Sancto non potest ita loqui."

stum, 4), "He who denies that Christ was a curse denies also that He died." Here belongs also the reference to 2 Cor. 5:21, where Paul says that Christ became a great sinner. Thus Christ was covered and clothed, as it were, with the foulness of all sinners because the Lord laid the iniquity of us all upon Him (Is. 53:6), and consequently He was covered with the misery of divine wrath and curse and abomination against sin, and bore it away. (John 1:29)

The *pro nobis* depends upon Christ being made a curse. *Pro nobis* means not for our benefit but in our place.

Therefore the curse which we brought down upon ourselves by our transgression of the Law Christ bore and sustained for us by taking our place. That is to say, He paid by His Passion and death all the penalties which were owed by those who transgressed the Law. God imputed our obligations to His Son as to our Surety and Bondsman. On the basis of the Law God required from Him, as the one standing surety for the accused, the due penalties of sin. The Son voluntarily put Himself at the disposal of God the Father (Ps. 40:10, 11; Heb. 10:7, 9) and in our stead and place made Himself a bondsman on behalf of sinful man and a debtor. He took our cause upon Himself, that is, He undertook to pay all the debts of the world and to expiate all its sins. Thus the curse of the Law was not directed against the one who deserved it, but by an imputation arising from His suretyship against the One who took up our cause, and He truly felt and experienced that divine curse. (Thesis 34, γ, Obs. 3)

Christ was not made a curse in only a verbal or symbolic manner like the beasts of the OT which were merely types, but by implication and direct association, by im-

putation and involvement (*coniectione imputatione et applicatione*). And Christ was not merely a curse according to our way of thinking, but He was a curse to God. Nor was there anything contingent or fortuitous about this occurrence, but it was according to the determinate counsel of God (Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23). Christ submitted Himself knowingly and willingly (John 13:1; 18:4; Heb. 10:7, 9; 9:14)

We can speak of still another specific *objectum reale pro quo* of Christ's atonement, namely, the power of the devil. Heb. 2:14, 15 must here be considered. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Notice first that the power of death is attributed to the devil, not, however, as a lord, but as a licitor and hangman. It is God, the Giver of the Law, who has absolute power over death, but since the entrance of sin into the world He allows the devil to be His hangman. The *κατάργησις* does not mean an annihilation of the devil but a taking away of his power and tyranny. The *κατάργησις* will occur most completely when all things are put under Christ's feet (1 Cor. 15:23-28; Rev. 20:14). The means of this victory and destruction is again the death of Christ. Through death He destroys him who had power over death, and this occurs partly by the confusion of Satan, whose machinations fail and bring about his utter disgrace, and partly through the overthrow of his power in that Christ broke the bands of death and hell and opened for us a way of escape (Ps. 68:20), and partly

finally by taking the devil captive, restraining his power and allowing him to harm no one belonging to Christ. Notice that the apostle in this passage does not say we are freed from death but from the fear of death. Although Christ has freed us from eternal death, which is the second death, and also from temporal death, which is the result of sin, so that death no more has any claim over us, still there is nothing more dreadful to a sinner than death. By fear of death the apostle means a bad conscience, which knows the just judgment of God and is disturbed by sin. By bondage he means the state of corruption; after the Fall and before regeneration all men are in such a state and are under the devil, they are unable not to sin and do evil and serve the devil. But from such servitude Christ freed us by His Passion and death, and when we become His we can bear not only the fear of temporal death but death itself, for He has suffered it in our place. The ἀπαλλάξῃ points significantly to the great reconciliation of the human race with God whereby the wrath of God and curse of the Law which we deserved for our sins was endured by another, Christ.

We may speak finally of death and hell as a specific *objectum reale pro quo* of the atonement. Death, both temporal and eternal, is the result of sin (Rom. 6:23). Hos. 13:14 and 1 Cor. 15:54 tells us Christ is the plague of death and the destruction of the grave; thus He ransoms and redeems us from these enemies. Through Christ the destruction of death is effected: it is called κατάποσις, a swallowing up. This victory over death Christ really accomplished by descending into hell and taking captivity captive, being gloriously triumphant over the devil, death, and hell.

5. The personal object of Christ's satisfaction is the entire sinful race (cf. Rom. 5:6; 1 Peter 3:18; 1 John 3:16, where the context indicates that the ὑπέρ means in the place of, denoting a substitution).

According to God's serious and sincere good pleasure, by which He desires all men to be saved, we must say that satisfaction was made for *all* men, not just apparently or according to a particular way of thinking, but really and truly. This important fact is brought out explicitly in many passages from Scripture. Is. 53:6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." The hiphil of נָשָׂא, which means to light upon, strike, encounter, denotes that sins have settled down upon the Messiah and like a torrent overwhelmed Him. The context shows that as the whole human race went astray, the sins of the entire race were laid upon the Messiah. Speaking to Matt. 20:28, Quenstedt makes note of the ἀντί, which would indicate that Christ was a victim in our place. The "many" is not to be taken in an exclusive sense for some, but extensively and universally for all (cf. this common Hebraism also in Dan. 12:2 and Rom. 5:19). Quenstedt comments next on Rom. 8:32: "God spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all." God allows the torments and punishment to strike His Son and does not spare Him; He is tortured and crucified for us. But the apostle adds significantly "for us all." Here universal grace is set forth so that every sinner may have the promise of complete satisfaction for all his sins.

The same thought is expressed in 2 Cor. 5:14, 15, where it is said in so many words that Christ died for all, meaning clearly

that the death of Christ was effective and adequate as a ransom for all sinners. Quenstedt expends great pains showing how the words of this verse teach (1) that Christ's death was a true death; (2) that it was a vicarious death; (3) that it was universal in scope. The clause "then all were dead" will admit no limitation to the universal effect of Christ's death. In passages like this the *finis competens* of Christ's death must always be borne in mind. It is not an absolute death; it is always spoken of in reference to sin, the curse, the world. It is the world which has been reconciled to God, and the Word of reconciliation is to be brought to the whole world. Surely no one would seriously think of restricting the preaching of the Word to only some. The meaning of the verse then is quite simple. When Christ died for sin, it was according to God's reckoning as though the whole world died for sin.

Quenstedt has some interesting comments on Heb. 2:9: "That He [Jesus] by the grace of God should taste death for every man." What is implied when it is said that Christ tasted death? The term γεύεσθαι is employed with death in a number of other passages where the context points without doubt to physical death (Matt. 16:28; Mark 9:1). However, in John 8:52 the γεῦσις θανάτου must be understood as referring to eternal death, or hell. For here the words οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θάνατον εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα can only point to θάνατος αἰώνιος. This is the death which Christ, the Captain of our salvation, tasted: a death corporal and temporal, but spiritual and eternal as well. The death which He endured was, of course, not eternal by virtue of its duration, for that was accidental to eternal death. But in that Christ

endured pains of soul and the horror of being forsaken by God, He suffered eternal death and the suffering of hell. A second point to be observed is that Jesus tasted death "for every man." Notice the use of ὑπὲρ παντός, *pro omni*, not ὑπὲρ πάντων, *pro omnibus*: Not just the human race as a whole has been benefited by the death of Christ, but He has tasted the pains of eternal death in the place of each and every sinner. Finally we are to notice that Christ tasted death for each and everyone according to the *grace* of God. Christ's death did not happen out of necessity or because we were deserving of anything from God, much less because there was any guilt associated with His life, but Christ tasted death χάριτι θεοῦ, because God is merciful toward us and wants His Son to die for us.

The ὑπὲρ πάντων is brought out also in 1 Tim. 2:6, where Christ, the Mediator between God and men, is called a ransom (ἀντίλυτρον) for all. That the "all" does not mean only the elect is seen from v. 1 of the same chapter, where Paul urges prayers and intercessions to be made for all men (ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων), and again in 4:10, where this Mediator is said to be the "Savior of all men" (cf. also John 4:42; 1 John 4:14), and in the most immediate context of v. 4, which announces the will of God to save all men and to lead them to a knowledge of the truth.

That Christ's vicarious work extends to all the world is brought out again by John 1:29, where the term "Lamb of God" may be understood *analogically* as pointing back to the Passover victim spoken of in Ex. 12:3 ff. and elsewhere. The Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ who was to be the Sacrifice for us (1 Cor. 5:7). But the term must also be taken *materially* as the true

Lamb
ings
phari
all th
prop
wash
but is
by G
He v
enly
God,
God
(Rom
of ca
a bun
ferre
carrie
One
ing
38:1
ἡ ἀμ
best
to be
mine
sin,
other
τὰ ρ
cific
Rom
this
all m
gener
been
lute o
Th
4
fuit e
et gr
morti
efficaci
solos
salute
MDC

Lamb which all the Old Testament offerings only prefigured. Therefore the emphatic ὁ ἀμνός, contrasting this Lamb with all the Levitical lambs as the One who the prophets had predicted would come and wash away sin. This is no ordinary lamb, but is the Lamb of God, the One appointed by God Himself to be a victim. "Therefore He was the true Lamb of God, the heavenly Lamb, the Lamb who was Himself God, the Lamb who offered Himself to God that He might perfect the saints" (Rom. 3:25). The αἴρων denotes the act of carrying or bearing, the transferal of a burden and as well the bearing of a transferred burden. The burden which Christ carried is sin, and He bore this burden as One guilty of sin (Lev. 5:5), as One taking the burden away from another (Is. 38:17). The burden is the singular ἡ ἁμαρτία, which is the reading in the best ancient MSS. By ἡ ἁμαρτία is not to be understood only original sin (Bellarmine), but everything which can be called sin, all sin collectively. There are many other passages where the singular ἡ ἁμαρτία refers not to original sin, but to specific acts of sin (cf. John 8:46; 15:22, 24; Rom. 3:9, 20). Finally it must be noted in this passage that the term κόσμος means all men and cannot be narrowed to future generations (Socinians) or those who have been chosen for eternal life by some absolute decree (Calvinists).⁴

The last passage taken up by Quenstedt

to illustrate that Christ's vicarious atonement extends to the entire world is 1 John 2:1, 2: "And He is the Propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." The "He," of course, is Christ θεάνθρωπος who in the unity of His natures became our ἱλασμός by suffering and dying and shedding His blood for us and thus destroying the works of the devil and bringing eternal righteousness to us. Of special importance in this verse is the οὐ μόνον, ἀλλά which denotes, according to Quenstedt, an αὐξησις, an intensifying of the meaning. By the οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δε μόνον the apostle is indicating all his readers who believe, all believers at that time, both Jews and Gentiles, for his epistle is catholic and addressed to all. If all believers of all times are included in the first part of the statement, then the contrasting καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου of the second half of the verse can only mean the entire human race.

The apostle contrasts a part with the whole (ὅλος ὁ κόσμος), that is to say, he contrasts himself and other believers with the entire human race; he is not contrasting some believers with other believers, nor does he distinguish between believers in respect to time and place. By the words ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου are understood all men, even those who are lost. Thus the sense of the verse must be this: Christ is the ἱλασμός not only for the sins of believing Christians, but of each and every sinful man and thus also of the damned. For here we have not only the general term κόσμος, which quite often in the Sacred Scriptures embraces men of all ages (Rom. 3:6, 19; 5:12, etc.), but we have added another term of universal connotation ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, "of the whole world." This is done so that we do not suppose that propitiation has been made only for some, but rather

⁴ Cf. *Canons of the Synod of Dort*, II, viii: fuit enim hoc Dei Patris liberrimum consilium, et gratiosissima voluntas atque intentio, ut mortis pretiosissimae Filii sui vivifica et salvifica efficacia sese exereret in omnibus electis, ad eos solos fide iustificante donandos, et per eam ad salutem infallibiliter perducendos. (*Acta Synodi . . . Dordrechtii habitae Anno MDCXVIII et MDCXIX* [Leyden: Isaac Elzevir, 1620], p. 251)

believe that propitiation has been made for all men in the world equally through Christ. (Thesis 36-II, β, Obs. 3)

The basis which establishes the vicarious satisfaction is the value (*pretium*) of the entire obedience of Christ. This obedience includes (a) Christ's perfect obedience of the Law, and (b) His suffering the punishment which was due transgressors. "By *doing* He made compensation for the guilt which man wrongfully incurred, and by *suffering* He bore the punishment which man rightfully was to suffer." Thus we commonly speak of active and passive obedience. Quenstedt proceeds to speak in a more detailed manner of this obedience and its twofold nature:

Christ made atonement for sinful man in a twofold manner: first, by performing a complete and perfect obedience of the Law in our place and in this way fulfilling the Law; second, by taking upon Himself the punishment and curse of the Law which we had merited by our disobedience and willingly suffering all this. The point is that man not only had to be delivered from the wrath of God, the righteous Judge, but he also had to stand before God with a righteousness which he could not acquire except by the obedience of the Law. Therefore Christ undertook both tasks. He not merely suffered for us, but He also fulfilled the Law in all things, to the end that His fulfilling of the Law and His obedience might be reckoned to us for righteousness. (Thesis 37, n. 1)

Quenstedt then points out that the distinction between active obedience and passive obedience (which he traces back to St. Bernard) is not the most fortunate one. For the passive obedience must not be thought of as excluding the active, but rather including it. In His deepest suffering Christ

was active and willing.⁵ All three passages chosen by Quenstedt to support his thesis that the basis of the vicarious satisfaction is the obedience of Christ refer to the so-called active obedience. In Quenstedt's polemical section these passages are taken up in proving that Christ perfectly fulfilled the Law in our stead.⁶ Quenstedt no doubt feels that he has already discussed sufficiently the Scripture passages dealing with the suffering and death of Christ. The first passage for consideration is Ps. 40:6, where the Messiah speaks, "Thou hast opened Mine ears." This was the common way in which a Hebrew would indicate his willingness to obey the Lord (Ex. 21:6; Deut. 15:17). Thus when the Messiah speaks these words, the meaning is: "Thou, O God, hast brought Me, Thine only-begotten and beloved Son, into Thy continuous service. To this continuous obedience I give Myself as a faithful Servant." The opening of the Messiah's ears denotes a prompt, steadfast, and perfect obedience which the Son of God performed when He took upon Himself the form of a servant and became obedient unto death (Phil. 2:7). It must be noted that Hebrews, ch. 10, verse 5, follows the reading in the LXX in quoting this passage, "A body hast Thou prepared Me σῶμα δὲ κατηργήσω μοι." There is no difference here between the meaning of David and the New Testament when, quoting the LXX, it sub-

⁵ Quenstedt's caution here reminds us of Gerhard's words (*Loci theologici* [Tubingae: Sumtibus I. G. Cottae, 1762], VII, 70 a): "To separate the active and passive obedience of Christ is to upset and reverse the whole order of things and to substitute for the whole righteousness and obedience of Christ only a certain part of it."

⁶ *Systema*, Part Three, Cap. III, Membrum II, "De officio Christi," Sec. 2, Quaes. 3.

stitut
פָּרָה
also
and
obey
ment
for a
end.
tensio
provi
may
Fathe
"Hen
tifully
thing
flesh
same
excell
the sa
to th
40:7)
Cit
mark
in op
more
sion o
of th
is mo
it is
of C
action
Cit
point
being
He m
concl
tion v
6.
tion?
ment
for al

stitutes "body" for "ears." The Hebrew קָרָה means not only to dig or open but also to prepare by digging and opening and thus to give the means of hearing and obeying. The LXX and the New Testament merely substitute an antecedent action for a consequent one, or a means for an end. The result is that there is this extension of meaning: The Son is to be provided a body in order that His ears may be opened and He may obey the Father in accomplishing our redemption. "Hence the καταρτίζω corresponds beautifully to the verb קָרָה. For all these things were accomplished at once: The flesh was united with the Logos; at the same time the flesh was enriched by the excellencies of the divine nature; and at the same time also the flesh was appointed to the priestly office." (Thesis 37, *ad* Ps. 40:7)

Citing next Matt. 5:17, Quenstedt remarks that the κατάλυσις, which is placed in opposition to the πλήρωσις, points to more than just a violation and transgression of the Law; it points to an abolishing of the Law. Contrariwise the πλήρωσις is more than a mere explaining of the Law; it is a perfect obedience and conformity of Christ's whole life and of all His actions.⁷

Citing finally Gal. 4:4, 5, Quenstedt points out how the purpose of Christ's being made under the Law was that (ἵνα) He might redeem us. The ἵνα clause shows conclusively that the basis of our redemption was Christ's obedience under the Law.

6. What is the nature of this satisfaction? What precisely takes place? A payment in kind and entirely adequate is made for all that we owed. Put slightly differ-

ently, Christ freely took upon Himself our whole debt; God in divine righteousness imputed this debt to Him, and He paid it fully: thus the Messiah says, "I restored that which I took not away" (Ps. 69:4). After a full exegesis of Ps. 69:4 Quenstedt proceeds to emphasize that Christ's payment was entirely in kind and entirely satisfactory. He says:

This payment of another's debt which was freely undertaken by Christ and imputed to Him according to divine judgment was not sufficient just because God accepted it. God did not, out of liberality, accept something in this satisfaction which was not in itself sufficient. Neither did God by demanding rightfully the punishment due us, a punishment which was taken by our Bondsman (*Sponsor*), relax any of His justice. No, in the satisfaction Christ endured everything which the rigor of God's righteousness demanded, even to the degree that He experienced hellish punishments, although not in hell and not eternally. At the same time there is, of course, here a certain tempering of divine mercy and divine justice and a sort of softening of the Law in this, that the Son of God Himself took His stand as our Bondsman and Satisfier, that the satisfaction which He brought was accepted, that another Person was put in the place of those who were actually guilty; but this takes away nothing from the satisfaction itself. Hence the satisfaction of Christ is completely sufficient and final in itself by virtue of its own intrinsic, infinite value. This infinite value arises from two facts: 1. the Person making the satisfaction is infinite God, 2. the human nature by means of the personal union was made to share in the divine and infinite majesty, and therefore its suffering and death are regarded as having infinite value and worth as though belonging to the divine nature. (Thesis 39—40)

⁷ Cf. p. 405, 1715 ed.

The last sentence of this statement is so important to a proper delineation of the doctrine of the atonement that Quenstedt feels constrained to repeat briefly what he has already said in great detail in his discussion of the personal union and the second genus of the communication of attributes. He confines himself to a study of one significant Scripture passage, Acts 20:28: 'Ο θεός τὴν ἐκκλησίαν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. The subject in this verse, the *causa efficiens* περιποιήσεως *ecclesiae*, is God in the proper and absolute sense of the word, i.e., the one true and infinite God. That the subject is not God the Father (Socinians), but Christ or *Deus ἔνσαρκος*, Quenstedt attempts to prove in the following manner: (a) Scripture indicates that Christ possesses the church equally with the Father. For instance, 1 Cor. 1:2 speaks of "the church of God" as "those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus." Again in 1 Cor. 10:32 we meet the term "church of God," but again Christ is not excluded from the thought, for He is the "Lord" referred to in vv. 26 and 28 and clearly in v. 21 (cf. 1 Cor. 11:23, 32). (b) The reference to God's own blood indicates that Christ must be subject of the clause and that the τοῦ θεοῦ refers to Him. (c) Περιποιήσις *ecclesiae* is never attributed in Scripture to the Father or the Holy Spirit but only to Christ (Eph. 1:14; 1 Thess. 5:9; 2 Thess. 2:14). (d) The God who has purchased the church with His own blood is the One who has instituted the ministry according to the context of the verse. This is Christ (Acts 20:24; 1 Cor. 3:11). The conclusion can only be that Christ, the Son of God, sheds His blood (which of course is a property of His human nature), and that this is an

act of God. The *mode* of this transaction of Christ is brought out by the περιποιεῖν, which in Scripture is used to express what takes place in bringing about our redemption (Eph. 1:14; 1 Thess. 5:9). We have here a redemptive transaction (*negotio redemptionis*) which does not imply that something is gotten without a price being paid, but rather that a possession is acquired by the correct payment of a correct price (*interveniente vera veri pretii solutione*), that is, we become Christ's own by the sufficient doing and suffering of Christ (*satisfactionis et satisfassionis Christi negotium*). The περιποίησις is accomplished with God's own blood; therefore it is not a simple acquisition, but an adequate acquisition (*satisfactoria acquisitio*). The object of this περιποίησις is the church, the called of God, whom Paul commends to the care of the bishops and ministers, among whom grievous wolves will enter in, and out of whom false teachers shall arise. The context indicates that Paul refers to the church here not as the elect, but as the called, as the visible body which contains hypocrites along with the believers. The means of the περιποίησις is God's blood. It is called God's "own blood" not because it is natural to the Son of God, but because it is His personal blood.

7. On the part of God there are two purposes for the vicarious atonement. First, His divine justice must be satisfied, for God is not willing to remit sins without satisfaction being made. Quenstedt insists that this contention is not his personal conjecture, but is based solidly on what Paul says in Rom. 3:24-26. The δωρεάν here does not rule out a price paid (cf. Matt. 10:8; 2 Cor. 11:7), but human work-righteousness and merit. The *causa finalis* of

Chr
οσύ
this
μη
whi
cor
but
ness
eou
and
othe
mar

T
si
w
a
w
in
th
sa
th
bo
si
M
by
re
in
O

T
aton
the
race
His
Son
3:16
Com
in th
ing

T
me
H
wi
tu

Christ's work here is ἔνδειξις τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ (v.25). The δικαιοσύνη in this verse is to be taken as *iustitia* διαμετρική *et* ἀνταποδοτική, a righteousness which rewards or requites, not viewed according to the rigor of God's justice only, but as an evangelical, equitable righteousness (ἐπιείκεια *evangelica*). This righteousness is a modulation of righteousness and mercy. Thus God punishes the sins of others in His Son, who was made a bondsman for sinners.

The ἔνδειξις of God's righteousness consists in this, that the sins of the entire world were heaped upon Christ by a fair and equitable transferal, and these sins were punished in Him, although He was in Himself free of all sin. Paul points to this purpose [of the satisfaction] when he says in v.26, "that He might be just," that is, that God might be recognized to be just in punishing with all severity the sins of the human race in His Son, the Mediator, and in not remitting sins except by means of and because of the bloody redemption of Christ and through faith in Him. (Thesis 41, *ad* Rom. 3:24-26, Obs.)

The second purpose of the vicarious atonement on God's part is to show forth the mercy which He has toward our fallen race. And how more clearly could He show His love for us than by sending His own Son to be our Substitute (Rom. 5:8; John 3:16; 15:13; Eph. 5:25; 1 John 3:16)? Commenting on the meaning of the ἀγάπη in these verses, Quenstedt has these touching words to say:

This is the love of God: rather than banish men eternally from heaven, He removed Himself from heaven, clothed Himself with flesh, became a Creature of a creature, enclosed Himself in the womb of the

virgin, was wrapped in rags, laid in hay, and housed in a barn. Nor does His love stop at this point; but after a life spent in poverty and adversities this love drove Christ to the ground on Olivet, bound Him in chains, delivered Him to jailers, cut Him with the lash, crowned Him with thorns, fastened Him with nails to the cross, and gave Him to drink the cup of bitterness. And finally this love compelled Him to die, to die for adversaries and enemies (Rom. 5:6). Continuously and in these sundry ways Jesus, who thirsted so greatly for our salvation, declared His love and mercy toward the human race. (Thesis 41, *ad* Rom. 5:8, Obs. 1)

The purpose of the vicarious atonement so far as we are concerned (*ex parte nostri*) is that we might have the perfect righteousness of Christ and be saved eternally. Here the first passage to be considered is Dan. 9:24: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." The angel is commemorating for Daniel the results and fruits of the vicarious suffering and death of the Messiah. The first result is the restraining of transgression, which in Hebrew denotes a malicious and persistent rebellion against the holy God. Significantly the verb used here means to subdue, hold back, restrain. Thus this restraining of transgression is like the imprisoning and subduing of a savage and unmanageable beast. This has been accomplished by the Messiah, lest any further trouble come upon our poor human race. Luther has correctly rendered the passage: *der Suende wird gewehret werden*. The

second result is the sealing up of sins. Here the Hebrew word מִטְּאָוֶת denotes every aberration from the standard of the Law, whether voluntary or involuntary, whether a sin of omission or commission. There is a variant reading of the verb in this strophe. The LXX and Luther seem to have followed a reading which would denote a sealing up of sin, thus a removal of sin from God's sight by an act of closing it off. The Vulgate and Aquila must have read מִלְּהֶתֶם, for they render the Hebrew by *finem accipiet* and τοῦ τελειῶσαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν respectively. In this case the sense would be that an end is made of sins — not that they are no more, but that they are not imputed to those who embrace the merits of Christ. The third result is reconciliation, or the expiation of iniquity. In this verse מְצַח means the offscouring of the sins of the whole human race, the results of sin. לְכַפֵּר, which means to propitiate sacrificially, points to the erasing and wiping out of our iniquity. In the Old Testament the blood of the sacrificial beast (which was a type) propitiated for sin, and sin no longer remained in God's judgment. The sacrificial animal was looked upon as the one to which sin and guilt attached. In the same manner the Messiah makes a propitiation or ἱλασμός; within 70 weeks He makes a propitiation by offering Himself as a victim (Eph. 5:2). The fourth result, according to this verse, is the bringing or restoring of everlasting righteousness (cf. Jer. 23:5, 6; 33:15, 16, where the Messiah is called "a righteous Branch" and "the Lord, our Righteousness"). Through Adam the original righteousness of man was lost (Eph. 4:24). The "everlasting righteousness" (*iustitia seculorum*) in the text is that original, primeval

righteousness. Now it is promised that this righteousness shall be restored. The Messiah will come with His perfect active and passive obedience, which will be imputed to believers. The Messiah will atone for sin, suffer our punishment, and render perfect obedience to the Law, not for His own sake, but for others (cf. v. 26). Thus it is not the righteousness of our works that is spoken of here; such a righteousness is only momentary and transitory and does not avail before God. It is rather צִדְקַת עֲלָמִים, not restricted to a certain time; it is the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:11), a righteousness of infinite worth. The righteousness is called eternal because God from eternity decreed that this righteousness would avail before Him and be imputed to faith. It is called eternal righteousness also because of the Person who acquired it, a Person who is eternal and therefore performed in time an eternal and infinite righteousness. Finally it is called eternal because the fruits of this righteousness remain to all eternity.

The second passage which brings out the results of Christ's atonement *ex parte nostri* is 2 Cor. 5:21. Quenstedt is most thorough in dealing with this *sedes doctrinae*. The subject of the verse is ὁ μὴ γινούς ἁμαρτίαν, viz., Christ (cf. v. 20). When Christ is said to know no sin, this is no reference to His divine omniscience (cf. 1 John 3:20), or to some sort of *negatio notitiae* on his part, but the reference is to His deeds (like the τὸ μὴ ποιῆσαι ἁμαρτίαν in 1 Peter 2:22 and Is. 53:9). Christ did no sin and was removed from any inclination toward and possibility of sin. In Him was only simple holiness and righteousness. The apostle speaks of the holiness and sinlessness of Christ according to His human

natur
to t
of s
tim
less
whi
was
Hin
of t
be
full
(Co
infr
the
this
rouc
T
vers
God
(3)
be r
term
deno
(Ge
or s
Ps. 4
be u
(Soc
only
as Is
trans
riav
in S
that
ing
very
that
by a
He v
the
wish
used

nature to bring out the fact that according to that nature Christ was made the subject of sin by imputation and was made a victim for sin. The explanation for the sinlessness of Christ is the personal union which we observe mentioned in v. 19, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." This "being in Christ" is not of the same kind as when God is said to be present in believers; rather it is the fullness of the Godhead dwelling in Christ (Col. 2:9); it is the divine nature and infinite essence of the Logos united with the flesh in the person of Christ. Thus in this union the human nature cannot be touched by sin.

Three things are predicated in this verse: (1) Christ is made to be sin by God, (2) He is made to be sin for us, (3) He is made to be sin that we might be made the righteousness of God. The term "sin" has several significations: it may denote the results or punishments for sin (Gen. 19:15), or it may denote the victim or sacrifice for sin (Hos. 4:8; Lev. 4:3; Ps. 40:6). Both of these meanings must be understood in the present context. Some (Socinians) have said that the verse means only that Christ was found among sinners, as Isaiah says, "He was numbered with the transgressors." But the term ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν is never found with such a meaning in Scripture. And the verse clearly says that Christ was sin according to the reckoning of God. "Hence Christ will be that very thing which God makes Him to be, that is to say, He will be a true sinner by a true and most real imputation. Nay, He will be the greatest of all sinners under the sun, as the abstract noun used here wishes to emphasize." The abstract is often used for the concrete or the substantive

for the adjective, and this for the sake of emphasis (Gen. 3:6; 12:2, etc.). Thus when God made Christ sin, the meaning is that He made Him a sinner, the greatest of all sinners. The verb ποιεῖν is used to denote a divine imputation (cf. Rom. 2: 25, 26). The making is an imputation and does not imply that there was any sin actually dwelling inherently in Christ. The ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν expresses substitution. "It is clear that Christ was made to be a sinner by imputation that He might be a substitute and representative in the place of our human race, although in His person He was and would always be utterly holy." Finally this text says that Christ was made sin that we might become the righteousness of God. The δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is not the original or essential righteousness of God. It is indeed a righteousness which is foreign to us (*ex parte nostra aliena*), not inherent, but imputed to us by a merciful God. It is opposed to any righteousness which we work out for ourselves (cf. Rom. 10:3 and Phil. 3:9). The ἐν αὐτῷ tells us the nature of this righteousness. It is the righteousness of Christ acquired in His life and death, a righteousness which becomes ours through faith.

Here we have a most precious exchange taking place: Christ takes to Himself our sin that He might give to us His righteousness. He who in Himself is completely holy and inherently righteous has been made sin by the imputation of our sins. In like manner we who in ourselves are sinners and inherently unrighteous are made to be the righteousness of God, that is, we are made perfectly righteous before God by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. (Thesis 42, β, Obs. 2)

The third passage chosen by Quenstedt to express the fruits of Christ's satisfaction

is Heb. 9:11, 12. Here an eternal redemption is spoken of, eternal in the absolute sense. This redemption acquired by Christ is eternal in God's just reckoning because it was considered by the Father from eternity and into eternity and because it is eternally valid in that it frees us from eternal death and acquires for us an eternal inheritance. It is said that Christ by His own blood "found" this eternal redemption for us. This redemption was something no one else could "find." That Christ found this redemption means that He alone is its Author. And He found it only with much care and labor. The εὐράμενος expresses not only the idea that Christ laboriously worked out our redemption but also a judicial thought (cf. the use of the verb in Gal. 2:17; 2 Cor. 5:3; Acts 13:28). Thus the forensic idea is coupled with the image of redemption.

Another Bible passage bringing out the fruits of the vicarious satisfaction is Heb. 5:8, 9: "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." The learning which is here spoken of does not refer to a gradual comprehending of teaching and facts (*doctrinae perceptio*) but to a knowledge which is acquired by experience (*experimentalis notitia*). By experience Christ understood (*cognovit*) and became well acquainted with the difficulty of obeying God, the difficulty of suffering the crucifixion and actually dying the shameful death of the cross. He endured His Passion out of obedience, and therefore that suffering pressed Him all the more. The obedience is to be understood in the broad sense as having its beginning with

the κένωσις and the λήμψις μορφῆν δούλου and as being accomplished in all the deeds and in all the sufferings of Christ until the last moment of His exinanition. The τελείωσις points to the perfect rendering of Christ's priestly work. A perfect sacrifice has been offered by this Priest. A perfect absolution has been acquired for all people. He is therefore said to have been made the cause (αἷτιος) of an eternal salvation to all who obey Him. Christ is called a cause of an eternal salvation by virtue of His execution and fulfillment of a duty given Him in the eternal counsel of the Godhead (Rom. 16:25; Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:26; 2 Tim. 1:9). The force of the αἷτιος must not be minimized (cf. Heb. 2:10). Christ is not merely a means (*causa media*) whereby we are saved; He is the Source (*causa principalis*) of our salvation; not merely the minister but also the Author and Lord of our salvation; He has merited salvation, and He gives it us. "Therefore the fruit of Christ's suffering and obedience is our eternal salvation, for by His obedience unto the death of the cross He not only merited eternal salvation for us but also imparts it to believers." (Thesis 42, 8, Obs. 3)

8. The vicarious atonement begins at the moment of Christ's exinanition and terminates with His death. Every act of Christ from the moment of His conception to His death was substitutionary. That He was in the womb nine months, that He was born in poverty, that He endured throughout His life misery, hunger, thirst, cold, etc.—all this He endured for our sakes and in our place.

9. Quenstedt concludes his discussion of the vicarious atonement with a final definition of satisfaction:

Sat
of
dec
of
ing
Bon
wh
mis
sel
by
suff
had
wh
thro
on
By

Satisfaction is an act of the priestly office of Christ, the God-man. From an eternal decree of the Triune God and for the sake of His great mercy Christ gladly and willingly substituted Himself as the Surety and Bondsman for the entire human race, which had been cast into unspeakable misery through sin. By taking upon Himself each and every sin of the whole world, by His most perfect obedience, and by His suffering of the punishments which men had merited He satisfied the Holy Trinity, who had been grievously offended, and that through the whole time of His exinanition on earth and especially in His last agony. By thus making satisfaction He procured

and merited for each and every man remission of all sins, exemption from all punishments of sin, grace and peace with God, eternal righteousness and salvation. (Thesis 44)

The purpose of this article has been to review the doctrine of the vicarious atonement as formulated in Lutheran Orthodoxy. The study has shown us not only that the Lutheran theologians of this era have left us a mass of useful terminology in this area but it has also demonstrated that they present a well-balanced and most timely Scriptural account of the whole doctrine.

St. Louis, Mo.

BRIEF STUDIES

LIGHT AND GLORY: DEVOTIONAL REFLECTIONS ON THE HOLY GOSPEL FOR FEBRUARY 2

The Gospel account of the presentation of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary sets four people before us. We shall look at them in turn: first at our Lord Himself; then at the Blessed Virgin Mary; next at St. Simeon the Seer; finally at St. Anna the Prophetess.

I

ST. LUKE 2:22-32

Our Lord's role is passive, inevitably. Yet this is first and foremost *His* day, *His* feast. He is the Cause and Center of everything that happens, the Focus of universal attention. We are so used to the King James Version's account that we forget that the holy Gospel begins in the original, "When the time came for *their* purification, according to the Law of Moses, they brought Jesus up to Jerusalem to present Him to the Lord." Thus the evangelist conceives the occasion as the purification not only of the Mother of God but also of our Lord, in the sense that it was His birth that occasioned the carrying out of the ancient rituals which the Pentateuch (Ex. 13:2 and parallels; Lev. 12) traces back to the decades of Israel's desert wanderings. It is our Lord who as the first-born male child of His mother is holy to the Lord and whose release from His obligation must be bought for five shekels of temple silver. It is He whom St. Simeon takes up in his arms and hails as God's Salvation and all mankind's Light, He for whom Saint Anna is to give thanks and about whom she is to speak to all who were looking for Jerusalem's redemption.

We may well be mystified that God let the event be recounted or even let it happen,

because the purification and the presentation and the poor man's sacrifice of a brace of turtledoves were all so unnecessary. This was the one birth that called for neither a burnt offering nor a sin offering to restore the mother who offered it to her place in Israel's worshiping congregation, for in connection with this virgin conception and this virgin birth there was no impurity to be purged away. No presentation of the heavenly Boy was needed to acknowledge the obligation and the dedication and the consecration of this Child to God, for this was God's eternally chosen Servant, God's appointed Worshiper par excellence, no less the Incarnate Word because He wore the form of a slave. We have no record that either the Mother of God or St. Joseph paid the five-silver-shekel fee to secure our Lord's formal release from the priest's hand. But all the silver and all the gold and all the wealth of the world could not have bought His release from the priestly ministry that was the whole purpose and end of His mission—a lifetime of sacrificing His will to the Father's and an expiatory death on the cross as simultaneous Priest and Victim.

The Holy Spirit has left it to us to infer why the presentation and the purification took place. It obviously witnesses to our Lord's complete solidarity with our human kind. He had not merely assumed human nature and become a human individual in the world of men, to wit, the Son of Mary, or as He appeared to the world, the son of Joseph the artisan. He did more. Through His own people He identified Himself fully with mankind in sin, in alienation, under wrath, under the Law. "When the time had fully come, God sent forth His Son, born of woman, born under the Law" (Gal. 4:4). The apostolic proclamation had affirmed it.

Now
it in
had h
Broth
aspect
human
home
that
and v
bonds

Bu
more
demo
sorry
logian
place
histor
a me
were
adopt
God L
vicar
and r
minist
the b
circum
necess
a part
He di

And
our p
He is
our ey
sacrific
pair o
silver
real o
can pl
And v
self-off
money
to His
obligat
union
in any
us acc

Now the evangelical record was illustrating it in its Spirit-stimulated recollection of what had happened in His holy infancy. He is our Brother all the way, not merely in the big aspects of shared human flesh and shared human blood but also, more subtly, in the homely aspects of religious and social ritual that in God's providence are the outward and visible signs of the inward and invisible bonds that tie men together.

But there is more to it, just as there is more to the Incarnation than a desperate demonstration on God's part that He feels sorry for our human plight. Whatever theologians may have to say about the absolute place of the Incarnation in God's design, in historic fact God used the Incarnation as a means to His end of redeeming us who were under the Law that we might receive adoption as children. At the very beginning, God lets His Son be publicly marked for His vicarious, representative ministry of expiation and reconciliation and liberation, and of that ministry we in our generation are still the beneficiaries. The presentation, like His circumcision and His Baptism, equally unnecessary by the canons of strict logic, are a part of His total obedience, part of all that He did and suffered for our salvation.

And when we go to God's temple to seek our purification and to make our offering, He is the only one whom we can set before our eyes and God's eyes. There is no other sacrifice that we can bring, just as even the pair of turtledoves or five shekels of temple silver were only tokens and types of His real offering. There is no sacrifice that we can plead except the one that He has brought. And when we present the symbols of our self-offering, our adoration, our prayers, our money, our good intentions, as our response to His generous gift, the only value these oblations have is what they derive from *our* union with Him. Our works are acceptable in any degree only because God has made us acceptable in His beloved Son. But in

Him the same God who was pleased to note and to recall that at His Son's presentation He received a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons is still pleased with our 20th-century equivalents—as long as we really bring them through His Son and in His Son and with His Son.

II

ST. LUKE 2:22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 33-35

The first impression of St. Mary in the account before us is that of a thoroughly self-effacing person. If the ancient tradition is right and the first two chapters of the Gospel According to St. Luke ultimately go back to the lips of the Blessed Virgin herself, the significance of this appears all the greater. In the three sentences in which she is a subject of the verb she does not appear once by herself. "They" brought the holy Child up to Jerusalem, and the plural subject of the verb, unexpressed by a pronoun in the Greek original, is clearly St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin. "The parents" bring the child Jesus into the temple to do for Him according to the custom of the Law. "His father and His mother" marvel at what St. Simeon says about the holy Child. She shares with her husband and her Son in Simeon's blessing, and she is singled out only as an object when St. Simeon, led by the Spirit, foretells the ministry and destiny of our Lord and predicts her own passion in connection with it. In brief, she exemplifies in her behavior the words that she takes on her lips: "My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God, my Savior, for He has regarded the low estate of His handmaiden; for behold, henceforth all generations will call me blessed" (St. Luke 1:46-48). She means what she sings. Do *we*?

The second characteristic that impresses us in this account is the determined earnestness of her piety. We have already reflected on the fact that the whole procedure here recounted was ultimately unnecessary. Whatever her insight into the mystery of salvation

in which she was so vital a participant may have been, the temptation to dispense herself from these ceremonies must have been very real. After all, neither Law nor custom required her attendance in the temple. The redemption of the son could be made before any priest. Even the mother's purification did not require her presence. That chore could easily be delegated to the ministering laymen who represented in the worship of the temple all the people who came from their district. Again, the ceremony was not particularly edifying. Liturgical efficiency experts had been at work, and a brisk commercialism pervaded the whole procedure. The price of the sacrificial turtledoves was calculated and announced once a month. The proletarian worshiper dropped the specified amount in chest number three in the court of the women. Once a day the chest was emptied, and half the contents was applied to sin offerings, half to burnt offerings. At the hour when incense was kindled on the golden altar, those who were present and the substitutes for those who were absent took their places, the sacrificial birds were dispatched with practiced skill, and the congregation departed, their liturgical defilements removed. Whatever prayer and praise did come out of genuinely grateful hearts remained unspoken. The significant fact in this connection is that the Blessed Virgin did *not* dispense herself, and her insistence on personal participation even under the circumstances described says something about the way *her* heart was fixed. It is something that *we* can take to heart.

The third impressive fact about her in the narrative is her amazement at St. Simeon's Nunc Dimittis. As we have already suggested, the Sacred Scriptures do not satisfy the curiosity of theologians about the extent of the Blessed Virgin's insight into the divine plan for the world's salvation. Apart from unrecorded revelations which she may have had, St. Gabriel's words at the Annun-

ation, St. Elizabeth's words at the Visitation, the angelic revelations to St. Joseph, and the staggering events of Christmas Night had given her enough to ponder. That is not to say that there were no gaps in her knowledge, or to suggest that she might have formulated the Decree of Nicaea or have anticipated by 15 centuries Martin Chemnitz's tract *On the Two Natures*. David Chytraeus is giving way to historical hyperbole when in his *Onomasticum* he describes the first church council in the New Testament as the one attended by St. Mary, St. Joseph, St. Elizabeth, St. Zechariah, and their intimates, which defined the mystery of the virgin conception of our Lord on the basis of the divine interpretation of the events in which they had been participants.¹ Still, by any criterion, the Blessed Virgin Mother must have known very, very much. But with all that she knew, the marvel is that she could still marvel at what was said about her Son. And yet the secret of this holy wonderment is no secret; it is disclosed every time that the Gospel of the infancy tells us that she *kept* all these things, *pondering* them in her heart (St. Luke 2:19, 51). Here is the antidote to that spiritual disease from which we all suffer — that acedia, that spiritual torpor and apathy and sloth and laziness and coldness of heart — which lets our little knowledge grow weary so promptly and after so little time spent in reflection, and which makes so sated and so satisfied so soon. If we too should learn the secret of keeping and pondering in our hearts the mighty acts and words of God, we too might marvel more.

So much for the Blessed Virgin as subject.

¹ "Prima Synodus Novi Testamenti fuit congressus Mariae, Elizabeth, Zachariae et aliorum, in quo promulgatus est Articulus de concepto et iuxta promissiones patribus datas exhibito Messia Redemptore, Luc. 1." From the "Catalogus Conciliorum" appended to David Chytraeus, *Onomasticum theologicum recens recognitum* (Wittenberg: [Clemens Scheidt et Antonius Schön], 1578 [1577]), p. 895.

She has one important thing to teach us as object. The lesson is hid in the parenthesis that St. Simeon inserts into his mysterious oracle. After describing her Son as being set for the fall and rising of many and for a sign that is spoken against, he adds: "A sword will pierce through your own soul also." Therewith he enunciates a fact in the case of the Blessed Virgin Mary that 19 centuries of Christian experience allows us to generalize into a principle: To be close to Christ involves getting hurt. St. Simeon is not talking about the pain of martyrdom, acute, brief, and glorious. No tradition of martyrdom surrounds the Virgin's falling asleep as the ward of St. John the Beloved either in Ephesus or in Jerusalem, and we do not read that a hand of violence was ever raised against her. The sword Saint Simeon foretells is not the efficient blade of the Roman legionary, but the barbarous, brutal, bloody, messy scimitar of the uncivilized Thracian. Hers was the slow sorrow, the protracted pain of seeing Him who was both her Son and her Savior misunderstood, misrepresented, deserted, hated, hounded, nailed to a cross as a common criminal, and mocked and blasphemed in the very hour in which He died to save His persecutors. The scimitar that pierced the Virgin's soul is still the occupational hazard of all those who walk in the company of her Son. If you belong to Him, it will be alternately poised over you and pressed into your soul as long as you live. It has no saving value in itself; our salvation, like that of the Blessed Virgin Mary, rests wholly on the atonement wrought by her Son. But when you feel the pain of the scimitar's piercing, rejoice, for this is one of the ways in which God is telling you that you are His.

III

ISAIAH 25:7-9; 46:13; 49:6; 52:7-10

The third of the four figures to whom the account of our Lord's presentation and the purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary di-

rects us is St. Simeon the Seer. It would be asking too much of flesh and blood to expect that the devout reflection of succeeding generations of Christians would leave this austere mysterious figure, who appears here and here alone in the sacred Record, unembroidered by pious fancy.

Thus the fabricators of apologetic but apocryphal gospels, like that ascribed to St. Nicodemus, gave him two sons, Charinus and Leucius, who allegedly were raised from the dead, were summoned before the Sanhedrin, described before Israel's high court their experiences in the underworld at the death of our Lord, and eventually saw their narrative ordered incorporated into the official register of the acts of the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate.

When a few centuries later the veneration of the saints began to find expression in the cult of their relics, the body of St. Simeon was conveniently discovered, translated to Constantinople, and ultimately shared with the Western Roman Emperor Charles the Great. At Aix-la-Chapelle, in consequence, the arm was exhibited against which the holy Child nestled while St. Simeon recited the *Nunc Dimittis*. Rival relics came into being, a whole body at Zara in Yugoslavia, another whole body in Bavaria, a head in Brussels, and in the words of a distinguished hagiologist of the last century, "numerous other relics, mostly of arms, elsewhere."²

A somewhat more sophisticated and scholarly version of the same spirit has ransacked the history of Jewry in the beginning of the Christian era and identified him with the eminent Rabban Simeon, who appears in the Talmudic tractate Shabbath as the president of the Sanhedrin between the administrations of Hillel and Gamaliel, an identification that several commentators justly describe as "precarious."

² Sabine Baring-Gould, *The Lives of the Saints*, 3d ed., XI (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1914), 165.

The fact is that the person of Simeon remains an enigma, possibly as a providential reminder that the prophecy is more important than the prophet, the message more important than the messenger, and the Word of God more important than the preacher.

Let St. Simeon be remembered for what the sacred page tells us about him. One thing it does not say, and that is that he was old although he may have been. It does characterize him by adjectives that express the ideal of Old Testament piety—devout, righteous, looking for the consolation of Israel. In an exceptional degree he was endowed with and responsive to divine inspiration. Within the span of 29 words in the Greek text of St. Luke 2:25-27 the Holy Spirit is mentioned three times—"the Holy Spirit was upon him," we are told; "it had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ"; "in the Spirit [RSV margin] he came into the temple" at precisely the moment when the Blessed Virgin Mary and St. Joseph brought in Our Lord. To complete the portrait, we have his own self-image in the opening words of the *Nunc Dimittis*. The term he uses of himself is δούλος, slave; the term he uses of God is not κύριε, the usual word that we render with "lord," but δέσποτα, "slave owner," and the indicative verb is ἀπολύεις, that is, "manumit, emancipate, set free." The picture is strikingly that of the petition in the collect for Christmas Day: "Grant that the new birth of Thine only-begotten Son in the flesh may set us free, who are held in the old bondage under the yoke of sin."

St. Simeon's credo finds expression in the hymn that he recites and the oracle that he utters. His God is a God who saves, and the salvation that the Seer affirms is one that God has prepared in the presence of all people as a witness that His plan embraces the whole wide world. The Christ of his faith is one in whom there is no East or

West, no North or South. He is the Redeemer not merely of a chosen race but a Redeemer in whom all races become chosen peoples, a light both for the tearing away of the veil that kept the non-Jewish world in dark ignorance of God's will and for the restoration to Israel of the blue radiance of the vanished cloud of glory that once dwelt behind the curtain of God's sanctuary.

Furthermore, St. Simeon's faith is tempered by a sober and holy realism. The Messiah is set forth for the fall and rising of many in Israel, a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense, a prodigy and a phenomenon of such dimensions that Israel could not ignore it, but of such a character that it would scandalize the Messiah's compatriots before imparting to them the power to rise and take their stand upon it. The Messiah is to unfurl a standard that will be a rallying point in the war between God and the prince of evil. But it will also be an ensign which attracts enmity both to itself and, as we have reflected, to those who would stand in its shadow. The Messiah is to be the Touchstone that will reveal the secrets of men's most intimate and ultimate loyalties.

Thus St. Simeon's credo becomes a literally improbable faith. A sensitive personality like his could not be unaware either of the general disillusionment and disappointment and secularization that marked the masses of Israel at the beginning of our era or of the tragedy of the proliferating sects that were draining off so much of what enthusiasm and moral earnestness there still remained. He would not have disagreed with the analysis of the situation three decades later that the fourth Gospel was to furnish retrospectively in two damning sentences at the end of the century: "The true Light that enlightens every man was coming into the world. . . . He came to His own home, and His own people refused to receive Him" (St. John 1:9, 11). This was part of the unpromising picture. The other just as unprom-

ising part lay in the fact that the divinely identified salvation was a six-week old Baby whose parents were a have-not artisan and his equally poor bride. The only assurance St. Simeon had was a word of God and enough contact with God to be sure of Him.

We have been told often enough by the social diagnosticians of our time that the confused second half of the 20th century is part of the post-Christian era. Precisely what the post-Christian era will bring is something that not even their prognoses make wholly clear. But whatever it is, it is not a roseate era of reassurance for the church.

These diagnosticians may be right. In any case it would be folly for us blandly to assume that they are wrong because we do not like the idea. But even if they are right, the prognosis is relatively unimportant. What is important is that the faith be carried forward by men and women like Saint Simeon, men and women who have the Word of God and enough contact with God to be sure of Him.

IV

ST. LUKE 2:36-38

Like St. Simeon, St. Anna is something of a mystery. As far as the bare biographical facts are concerned we know just enough about her to whet our curiosity. What is this descendant of the so-called lost tribe of Asher doing in Jerusalem? Was it the prominence of her father Phanuel that makes the evangelist remember his name in describing her while forgetting her late husband's? Had she carried on in her person the tradition of the women of her tribe, uniquely remembered in Israel for their beauty as proverbially fit brides for monarch or high priest?

In a period that acknowledged no male prophet in Jewry and in a culture that tended to minimize the role of women in public, she was revered as a prophetess in the tradition of a Miriam, a Deborah, and a Huldah.

In an era when longevity was a much rarer phenomenon than it has become among us in recent years, she had achieved the venerable age of at least 84, and it may be the intention of the text to tell us that she had passed 100. Thus her lifetime spanned the entire sad epoch of the Roman occupation of Israel, and old Abbot John Bengel of Alpertsbach calculates that she was 24 when Pompey's armies took the Holy City.

In a religious tradition that generally discouraged asceticism, she is remembered for her fasting and prayers in the temple night and day. In a social environment that brought strong pressure on young widows to remarry she had chosen at a relatively youthful age—at most in her early twenties—to defy the pressure and to live in holy widowhood. At the time when the worship of the temple was becoming to a notorious degree self-righteous, self-satisfied, coldly mechanical, and crassly commercialized, she pinned her faith and her hope, and she addressed her worship, to a God who would presently act to accomplish the redemption of Jerusalem by His intervention.

It is this astonishing woman who suddenly appears in the temple at the very hour that St. Simeon takes the holy Child from the arms of the Mother of God. The closing words of St. Simeon's blessing on the Holy Family merge into the anthem of praise with which St. Anna the Seeress gives thanks to God for the coming of the promised Christ. The verb implies no single paean. Instead it indicates that she kept on doing it, just as she kept on speaking of the holy Child to the company of those who were not merely hopeful but expectant about the early advent of Jerusalem's redemption. How great the circle of these waiting and watchful worshipers was we do not know; to justify the word "all" the number must have been considerable. In any case it was a circle whose faith in the God who saves was kept

alive—as our faith is—by mutual witness and by common worship.

Besides the necessity of this mutual worship and witness, St. Anna has one other thing to teach us. Christianity is by nature and by divine design a conservative faith, carefully concerned about transmitting unchanged from one generation to another the unalterable Gospel of a Redeemer who died and rose again for all of humanity in every generation. As long as it does not make our witness irrelevant, this conservatism is not to be confused with conventionalism, that professional disease of the vocationally religious which refuses to recognize the validity of any mode of serving God for which it has no carefully labeled pigeonhole. Conventionalism has no place for St. Annas.

Happily, an unconventional church, with nothing but St. Luke's account to go on, reserved a place for her in the *Martyrology*—the church's chronicle of her witnessing members—for Sept. 1: "At Jerusalem, Blessed Anna, prophetess, whose sanctity is revealed in the Gospel." With the church, not only on Sept. 1 or on Feb. 2, but at all times and in all places, we give thanks to God for St. Anna and for all who, conventional or not, are bound to the service of our Lord by the ties of the same faith and the same hope and the same love that bind us to Him. ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

THE FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE NCCC A Review

Observing the 10th anniversary of its formation, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. met in San Francisco, Calif., Dec. 4—9, 1960, for its fifth general assembly.

The person who attends the meeting of this organization for the first time cannot help above all to be impressed by its magnitude and the far-flung complexity of its activities. The 531 voting delegates, assembled

at this convention, represent 34 Protestant and Orthodox churches with a total membership of about 40 million. The largest group holding membership is The Methodist Church (9 million members), the smallest, the Seventh-Day Baptist General Conference (5,965).

The spectrum of denominational and doctrinal positions represented by the National Council is equally wide. There were present and active in full membership churches of such divergent form and theological orientation as the Five Year Meeting of Friends and the Orthodox churches (Romanian Orthodox Episcopate—50,000; Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America—755,000; Serbian Eastern Orthodox Church—150,000; Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church—110,000; Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America—44,350; Greek Archdiocese of North and South America—1,500,000).

On the roster of full membership are also the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, and The United Lutheran Church of America.

The business before this assembly indicated the comprehensive as well as the intensive program of the National Council. Its administrative organization makes provision for every type and phase of church work at home and abroad. Between assemblies its directives are administered by a General Board, a General Secretary, and a host of associate and assistant secretaries. The program is implemented by four major divisions: the Division of Christian Education, of Christians Life and Work, of Foreign Missions, and of Home Missions. Each of these divisions has special departments. The Foreign Missions Division, for example, has the following subcommittees:

- Africa Committee
- Associated Mission Medical Office
- Christian Medical Council for Overseas Work
- Committee on Co-operation in Latin America

Committee on Missionary Personnel
 Department of Overseas Union Churches
 Far Eastern Office
 Joint Office of Southern Asia and the Near
 East
 Radio, Visual Education, and Mass Commu-
 nication
 Rural Missions Co-operating Committee

In hearing the reports on this variegated and complex program and its discussion in the general assembly and in divisional meetings, an observer could not escape the conviction that the council's business is conducted by a host of highly competent and expertly trained men and women. It was also evident that the National Council was able to render effective and immediate service, particularly in times and areas of crisis, because it could marshal the combined and co-ordinated resources and offices of its member churches. One furthermore becomes convinced of the consecrated zeal on the part of all concerned to respond in obedience to the theme selected for the assembly: "Jesus Christ, Living Lord of All Life."

The desire to implement and put into effect this motto was spurred by the conviction that the churches of today could succeed only if efforts and resources were combined and unified. Conditions at home and the world over were often and impressively cited as demanding united action if Christianity is to survive and be able to cope with the threats that it faces: the wholesale surrender of our culture to the inroads of secularism and materialism; the world in revolution—politically, socially, ideologically; the worldwide threat of Communism; the rise of militant religions such as Mohammedanism; the new space age, with its purely scientific orientation.

No one can gainsay the serious consequences of these critical issues nor the advantage of a common front and united action in dealing with them. The question naturally arises therefore whether there are valid rea-

sons for withholding support and co-operation from an organization that has such high ideals and meets such an urgent need. This question was fashioned into a sharp shaft aimed at the Christian conscience by the oft-voiced warning against "the sin of separateness." "The Message to the Member Churches," officially adopted by the assembly, makes this charge in unequivocal language: "Not the churches' diversity but their separation from one another is the heart of this sinfulness."

In arriving at a God-pleasing answer, other questions thrust themselves upon an observer whose conscience seeks to be bound by the Word of God. Is the divided state of the church the only, or even the foremost, reason for the failure of Christianity to evangelize the world? Do the outward circumstances of a critical situation warrant disregard of divinely established principles that govern the proclamation of the Gospel? Is every and any means legitimate to meet a crisis? Are there in the will of God any restrictions how and when unity is to be manifested? Besides the command to preach, do we not have from the same Lord the injunction to be concerned that we teach men to observe all things that He has commanded? Does the preaching of a garbled or emasculated gospel become less sinful by making it a joint effort? Has not God in the past sent catastrophes by evil men and sinister forces to call the church to repentance for unfaithfulness and disregard of His good and gracious will? May God not be using new Assyrians and Babylonians for a new "exile" to purify His people? Granted that faith must also express itself in a genuine concern for the physical welfare of all men, is the church's foremost mission to be the amelioration of the social and economic evils of the world?

There were indications at San Francisco that some of these questions were not disregarded in the passionate plea for unity of action. There was witness to the fact that

sinful men can be united with God only through the sacrificial life and death of His only Son and His victorious resurrection. Attention was also called to this essential Gospel truth as the only motivating power for Christian living and conduct. This basic message was heard particularly in the worship periods conducted by Dr. Joseph Sittler Jr., and Bishop Lesslie Newbigin of India. A caution against indiscriminate co-operation was sounded by Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America in a message read to the assembly by his representative stating:

1) that there must be unity on the fundamentals of faith, going hand in hand with freedom in what does not affect faith — crowned with love — a quality so vital and the sole quality which can bind Christians together in all matters and at all times;

2) that Christian tradition is that term which identifies the conduct which at all times, by all Christians, everywhere, is practiced and believed.

But this observer came away with the impression that these expressions of concern were exceptional rather than general. It pained him to notice what appeared to be a studied reluctance to mention the vicarious atonement, or its equivalent in other terms, as necessary for the acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. Could it be that this foundation for all discipleship was suppressed out of consideration for members who might be offended by a "religion of blood"? Or was it merely presupposed?

The official literature does not allay these misgivings. The preamble to the constitution reads as follows:

In the Providence of God, the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the oneness in Jesus Christ, by the creation of an inclusive co-operative agency of the Christian churches of the United States of America. . . .

Where "The Message to the Member Churches" touches on the basis of a common allegiance to the Lord, an explicit reference to His atoning sacrifice is conspicuously absent. The opening paragraphs have this to say:

On the tenth anniversary of the formation of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, we are met to testify to our faith in Jesus Christ, the living Lord of all life.

We desire to proclaim that not only individual souls but all societies, all cultures, all civilizations must finally acknowledge his rule. *By his teaching and embodiment of the Law of Love* (italics not in the original) he is the One to whom every person must ultimately give account of his life. He is equally the standard by which every corporate activity must be appraised.

The protestation at this point that the National Council "has no theology of its own" hardly seems convincing. A number of the resolutions adopted by the assembly make unequivocal pronouncements on religious and moral issues confronting the Christian today that require a very definite theological basis to justify their validity. This is to say that the National Council must indeed have a theology to enable it to take a position and pass judgment on various questions that involve a doctrinal interpretation and application of Christian truths set forth in Scripture. Other equally sincere Christians may view these issues from a different theological position. And not the least controverted among these is the question of "the sin of separateness." It can, therefore, hardly be unfair to ask why the council hesitates to speak more clearly on the basic presupposition of its obedience to Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.

These observations of course do not imply that there were no delegates at the assembly, representing hosts of Christians, who accept

and believe in Christ Crucified as their Savior from sin and *therefore* the Lord of their lives. It is a disconcerting fact, however, that after 10 years their witness within the council apparently has proved to be so ineffective.

At the same time there appears to be a lack of clarity within the council as to its goals. In a panel discussion Bishop Arthur Lichtenberger of the Protestant Episcopal Church referred to the interpretation of the council's purpose as an unresolved issue and listed three objectives that various groups envision: (1) It is to be an agency of cooperation for the member churches; (2) It is to be a means to achieve the union of all churches; (3) It is to be a rallying point for a solid study of the role of the church in the world. He favored the last interpretation. The "Message" also calls attention to the need of clarification when it states:

We look to the National Council's new studies on the significance of councils of churches to enable the churches to dis-

cover, in obedience to Christ, both the nature and forms of the unity we seek. Special attention should be given to the extent to which church councils partake of the nature of the church. The National Council is not the church. But it calls men to the worship of God and seeks to make its corporate life an instrument of the Holy Spirit. It summons men to Christian obedience and helps them discern the conditions of such obedience. In it we have found rich, free, and vital fellowship. And the council bears witness to the fundamental solidarity of all Christians and thus points toward the church in its full unity.

In view of these uncertainties regarding the basis as well as the goal of the National Council it would appear to be charitable—to say the least—to recognize the scruples of such as hesitate to be identified by full membership in this organization.

WALTER R. ROEHR

HOMILETICS

Outlines on the Old Testament Eisenach Series

By HERBERT E. HOHENSTEIN

OCULI

JEREMIAH 26:1-15

This text poses a haunting question:

Will This House Be Like Shiloh?

And what was Shiloh like? Once during Israel's early history, a thriving and beautiful center of worship. Eli served as priest there. Centuries before Jeremiah's words in our text, Shiloh had been made a heap of ruins. Old Testament nowhere tells of the story of its destruction. Excavation reveals that it was destroyed around 1050 B.C., possibly by Philistines (1 Sam. 4:11). Shiloh's ruins, 18 miles north of where Jeremiah was speaking these words, were to preach a silent and grim sermon to the people of his day. These words preach the same sermon to us, pose the same question to us: "Will this house be like Shiloh?"

I. This was the question Jeremiah put to the people of his time

A. The prophet put the question because God told him to (v. 2). He had no choice in the matter. This sermon must have rent his pastoral heart. No gleeful gloating here. No "can't wait until I give it to them" attitude. Rather a heart heavy and torn by anguish over the need of speaking harsh words to his fellow Hebrews. But speak he must. For God's Word was upon him, and he did not want that fire shut up and blazing in his bones again.

B. He preached because his people needed to hear these severe words. (a) Something was wrong with their ears (v. 4). They were not listening to the voice of God's prophets. (b) Something was wrong with their feet

(v. 3). They were not walking God's paths. (c) Something was wrong with their hearts (Jer. 7:4, 8-10). They foolishly trusted in a thoughtless and routine performance of their religious rituals as a guarantee against God's anger deserved for their repeated sins. "As long as we're frequently in church," they thought, "we'll be safe and secure from God's wrath and trouble no matter what we do the rest of the week." They were wrong, as the Babylonian Captivity so tragically proves.

C. He spoke the naked, ugly truth—though it hurt both him and his hearers.

1. It took raw courage for the prophet to preach like this. Note where he proclaimed these words. It was in the court of the temple (v. 2). "The nerve of this preacher, standing here in these hallowed halls, denouncing these sacred precincts, telling us they won't help or shield us from some imagined, fantastic peril. This is the temple, God's own house!"

2. The prophet pulled no punches. His message wasn't toned down with such phrases as "Don't blame yourself; blame your parents or environment." Or: "Don't feel bad; you're trying your best. Besides, everyone else is doing it, too." He spoke the truth.

II. Must I put the same question to you?

A. Do I have a command from God? Indeed, I have. The Lord has ordered me to "reprove, rebuke, and exhort." He has commanded me not just to please your taste and fancy with honeyed words, but also to speak of every sin with conscience-jolting words, words that are meant to disturb any lethargy and lukewarmness.

B. Do you have a need for these words?

1. Is something wrong with your ears? Do they hear God's voice frequently and well? Or does that voice get lost and swallowed up in the loud noises and clamor of everyday life, business, family, fun?

2. Is something wrong with your feet? Do they walk God's paths persistently? Because our feet walk the ways of sin, the feet of Jesus stumbled beneath the crushing weight of a cross, the feet of Jesus were nailed to that cross so that God might pardon our wandering.

3. Is something wrong with your heart? Does it count vainly on once-a-week church attendance as the guarantee of God's favor and approval? What brings us to heaven is not our churchgoing but Christ's going to a cross, into a grave, and out of it again.

III. *What will your answer be?*

A. "It can't be: This great cathedral—or this neat and pleasant little structure, this church—one day a heap of ruins, a silent and sad testimony to God's wrath upon religious playactors? Fantastic! Incredible! Impossible!" A response like this would put us in the company of the Israelites. And they were tragically wrong. God did make the beautiful temple at Jerusalem a shambles.

B. May we learn our lesson from this. Don't question the possibility, or deny the justice of such a judgment, but in repentance correct the causes. Ponder and reflect on the sacrifice of Jesus for your salvation. Render God not simply the "sacrifice" of an hour on Sunday, but with that Sabbath offering, above all, the sacrifice of all-out consecrated lives.

LAETARE

ISAIAH 52:7-10

Today the mood of the fast is broken, the fast of Lent with all its solemnity and sadness. For this is Laetare Sunday, and that means,

"Rejoice!" Certainly we should rejoice in the light of these Bible words, for they tell us about

The Arm That Woke Up!

1. *There is an arm that once slept but now has awakened (Is. 51:9-11)*

A. The people of Israel spoke these words to God's sleeping arm. Why was it sleeping? Why didn't it wake up and come to the rescue of God's bondaged people in Babylon? Had it lost its power? Surely it wasn't weak or asleep long ago when it brought the fathers out of Egypt, dried up the Red Sea, and guided the people through the savage desert to Canaan. "God, has Your arm gone to sleep? Why doesn't it wake up and deliver us from Babylon even as it once did from Egypt?"

B. Do you sometimes talk like that in your life? Are there times when you are sure that God's arm is asleep? When you are held captive like the Israelites in your Babylons of crushing, unbearable pain, do you with the Israelites shout: "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord, and rescue us from our perils and adversities"? Yet does it seem that you are shouting your lungs out in vain? The divine arm slumbers on limp and inactive?

C. But God's arm has now awakened. Indeed, God bared His mighty arm. The sleeping arm woke up after 70 years and brought the enslaved Hebrews back from the land of Chaldea to their beloved homeland. The picture here is of a mighty warrior preparing for battle. He throws back his cloak so that it does not hinder him in his fighting. So God threw back His cloak, bared His great arm, and went to work to save His people.

D. For you, too, God has bared His holy arm. Indeed He bared it in the person of Christ, His Son, bared that arm when they stripped Him of His clothes and lashed His back with the claw-tipped scourge, bared His arm—yes, His body—when they nailed

Him to the cross. By that baring and dying you are freed from the devil, death, and all your sins. Yes, and on Easter, God once again rolled up His sleeves and bared His holy arm. See that mighty arm reach down from heaven, roll the big rock from the door of Christ's grave, and then raise the dead Jesus to new and eternal life. And by that Easter baring of God's great arm you are freed from the prison of your grave.

E. Let this baring comfort you in your present sorrows. The fact that God bared His arm in the death and resurrection of Jesus for your pardon and salvation is the reliable proof that He will one day bare that arm again, reach down, and rescue you from every pain and evil. It will happen when Christ reveals Himself at history's end, which is the beginning of your heavenly glory. Let these thoughts bolster you when you are tempted to think God's delivering arm is asleep.

II. There are some feet to tell us of that arm (v. 7)

A. The picture here is of a herald who comes with flying feet back to the city bringing the anxious inhabitants news of the battle. Who is winning? Shall we split the air with our victory shouts of praise to Jehovah, or shall we pack our belongings and flee from the conquering enemies advancing upon us? How breathlessly the people wait for the news, and how eager and impatient the herald is to bring it to them!

B. This time it is good news that the hurrying herald brings. And that is why his feet are so beautiful, so good to behold. For those running feet bring good tidings, news of victory and peace. The people won't have to prepare for siege or leave Jerusalem because of the advancing enemy. God is coming, leading the train of returning exiles from Babylon. No more battles, no more war—the captivity is over! God is bringing His people back. Not the Babylonian king, but

God is the One who reigns. God rolled up His sleeves, bared His saving arm, gathered His scattered people and is herding them home again. This is the good news the flying herald brings.

C. It's still the same today. Have you ever noticed the beauty of your pastor's feet? Oh, not because they are so physically, but because they bring your pastor to you in the pulpit, in your homes, at your bedside in sickness, when you need counsel and help. These feet of your pastor, however big and unsightly they may be, are beautiful because they bring him to you with the glad news that God has bared His arm for you. And by the baring of that arm in Christ's death and resurrection you have the good news of pardon for all your sins. You are sure that the war between God and you is forever over. He loves you with an everlasting love in spite of deep and repeated sins. You are sure of salvation from the devil, death, and hell's flames, and you hear the cheering proclamation: "Your God, your saving and loving God, rules—not your sorrows, not your evil habits, not cancer or heart trouble, not tragedies, not disasters, not death. Your God rules. Therefore be brave." Your pastor's feet carry him to you with this good news!

III. There are some eyes that watch for that arm (v. 8)

A. The picture here is of watchmen on the city's walls, straining to catch the first glimpse of God leading the returning band of exiles home from Babylon. Suddenly the group appears on the horizon. There is God at the front, guiding the group back. The watchmen's eyes catch those of the Lord, those smiling, divine eyes aglow with love—eyes that promise the shining, uplifted face of the Lord upon His people, the face of favor and blessing. It is small wonder, then, that these watchers on the wall break into singing and urge even the ruined, tumbled

ruins of Jerusalem destroyed by previous conquest to join in the happy chorus. "Look," shout the watchmen, "here comes the God with the bared arm, the arm that isn't sleeping any more. It did awake and put on strength. It did rescue our brothers from Babylon."

B. Even so I urge you to sing and shout for joy, sing in the midst of Lent because of Lent, or rather because of the suffering, dying, rising, and ruling Christ that Lent and Easter and Ascension commemorate. For like these watchmen on Jerusalem's walls, my eyes and yours, too, have seen God, who bared His arm in Christ for our salvation, for our deliverance from every pain and evil; and with the eye of faith, even now we see that God returning to our Zion, our world, our cemeteries, raising us all from our graves and leading us with shouts of praise and joy to the heavenly Jerusalem. Hallelujah!

JUDICA

NUMBERS 21:4-9

This sermon tackles the problem of griping. Its theme is

Grumblers, One and All!

I. Thus it was with the desert-journeying Israelites

A. They became impatient (v.4). The desert journey wasn't at all what they had envisioned. Or perhaps more accurately, it was tougher than they had foreseen. The sun was broiling and roasting them, the food and water were scarce, and the discomfort was abundant. And who could be expected to live joyfully on a week-in and week-out diet of manna?

B. Their discomfort moved them to hunger covetously for the past. They wanted their Egyptian fleshpots back again. Better a slave to the cruel taskmaster than in chains to the suffering of this savage wilderness.

C. Their discomfort moved them to grumble against God (v.5). (1) Such griping was an act of pride. It indicated a "we don't deserve such a fate" attitude. "God's people are better than heathen. It's morally wrong for God to let them suffer." It indicated a "He is a foolish God" attitude. "You're not being fair, Lord, in sending this suffering." (2) Such griping was an act of rebellion against God's guidance and plan. "We don't like or want Your wilderness way of suffering, Lord. We want *our* way—a way of green pastures and not barren deserts."

D. But didn't they have the right to grumble? Hadn't God promised to care for them in the wilderness? Where was that care? It was there all right but on God's terms, not theirs. Besides, even a divine promise does not convey to us the right to demand fulfillment of that promise when and how we will. Even His promises do not place the Lord in our debt (cf. Matt. 4:6, 7). Such an approach tempts God.

E. Mark well the punishment for grumblers. (1) They died by snake bite (v.6). (2) This only underscores the seriousness of grumbling. It is a sin unto death. The Lord does not regard it lightly.

F. Mark well how the snakes turned them to God (v.7). Affliction has a divinely intended goal: to bring people to their knees before God in admission of guilt and in repentance. Pain is God's megaphone to call us back to Himself.

G. Mark well God's antidote to the snake bite (vv.8,9). (1) There is marvelous grace in this. (a) God once again helped and healed these persistent grumblers, that He didn't say, "That's the last straw!" (b) Israel did nothing but look on the uplifted snake. Only the "effort" of a look. (2) There was divine irony in this: snakes were conquered by a snake. (3) There was a real challenge to faith in this. Look and live?

Preposterous! Fantastic! Ridiculous! See a doctor, maybe! But look and live? Absurd!

H. And see how the bitten people responded. They looked—and lived. This was no casual glance. This was a life-or-death look. Once bitten nothing mattered but the fastening of one's eyes on that uplifted snake.

II. *Even so it still is with us*

A. How often don't we grumble—about our aches of heart and body, our political officials, our church or pastor, our friends and dear ones, our job and boss or fellow employees, the weather?

B. But do we sense the seriousness of this sin? (1) That it is a terrible pride on our part? Our gripes are actually our way of telling God that He isn't wise, that He is unjust, that He is all wrong in His running of our world and personal lives. Our grumbling is a severe judgment of God's providence, love, and wisdom. (2) That it is a claim of independence from God? Gripping is a signal that we aren't at all satisfied with the Lord's direction and guidance, with His plans and goals for us. We want things differently, more comfortably, less full of suffering and sacrifice. We want to go it our way, not God's way.

C. Do we know the solution to this sin? It is not an uplifted snake but a raised Man, Jesus raised high on the cross, lowered into a grave, and then raised to new life again. And all this that God might forgive our grumblings and give us eternal life.

1. Once again there is marvelous grace here. (a) We are frequent gripers, dissatisfied fussers! Yet God refuses to abandon us. He still holds out His love and grace. (b) It is still a look that saves—the life-or-death look on Jesus, the uplifted Man (John 3:15). And it is as we fix our eyes on this uplifted Man, Jesus, that God gives us the strength to stop griping.

2. Once again there is divine irony here. Through a man Satan brought sin, pain, and death into the world. Through THE Man, Christ Jesus, God brings righteousness, joy, and life. Through a tree, Satan led our first parents and us to death. Through a tree—the cross—God leads us out of death into life.

3. Once again there is a real challenge to our faith. There is seemingly very little in this Man from Nazareth to commend Him as God's solution to sin and a blessed hereafter. How in this world or in the world to come can a mere look on this Man save us? There is a challenge. Let God help us to meet it. Then there will be a change from "grumblers, one and all," to "grateful, one and all."

PALM SUNDAY

ZECHARIAH 9:9-12

This prophecy of Zechariah tells us about
The King and You

I. *The King*

A. His significance in the Old Testament prophecy.

1. His coming would signal the end of Israel's conflicts (vv. 8, 10). A marvelous picture in v. 8. The reason wars and conquest will cease is that God Himself, and not simply frail, mortal armies, will encamp at the gate of His holy city. God will be His people's one-Man army. And of course He cannot be conquered. God will encircle His people like a range of towering, rugged mountains (Ps. 125:2). And is there any enemy strong enough to scale such a mountain range? Never again will God's people be hemmed in by foreign armies. Instead, they will be ringed in by their loving Lord.

2. He would preach a powerful sermon on humility (v. 9). He would ride into Jerusalem on a donkey. In early Bible times

distin
5:10
on d
on a
can n
Perh
displ
3.
Him.
a.
One
prom
of th
comi
and
had
upon
b.
dow
heral
enem
King
the s
deliv
the r
natio
62:1
c.
(v. 1
of ic
15 ff.
d.
11, 1
aa.
refer
for '
Baby
the r
rectio
woul
bb
oners
priso
never
delive

distinguished persons rode on asses (Judg. 5:10; 2 Sam. 17:23). From Solomon's time on downward no instance of royalty riding on a donkey. Word translated "humble" here can mean (1) poor; (2) afflicted; (3) meek. Perhaps a combination of all three here. No display of pomp or power here.

3. He would bring great blessings with Him.

a. Justice (v. 9). The Hebrew has צִדִּיק. One is reminded of Mal. 4:2, where God promises for His suffering people the rising of the "Sun of righteousness." With the coming of this King, that sun would arise and disperse the grey clouds of distress that had been pouring the cold rain of evil down upon God's people.

b. Salvation. The Hebrew is נִשְׁעָ, "endowed with salvation." This King would herald and assure Israel's rescue from all its enemies. Or the idea could be this: a saved King means a saved nation. The King was the symbol for the entire nation. If He is delivered from the hands of His foes, so is the nation. If He is conquered, so is the nation. (Cp. Is. 49:4; 50:8; 53:11 ff.; 45:8; 62:1)

c. He would restore national greatness (v. 10). Boundaries portrayed here are those of ideal Israel. (Num. 34:1 ff.; Ezek. 47:15 ff.)

d. He would set the prisoners free (vv. 11, 12).

aa. "Prison" and "pit" here are probably references to the Babylonian Captivity. Word for "pit" can mean a grave. Israelites in Babylon were as good as dead. Therefore the return from exile was indeed a "resurrection" by God (Ezek. 37). "Stronghold" would be Israel's native land.

bb. The released would be hopeful prisoners (v. 12). Although languishing in the prison of the Babylonian Exile, they were nevertheless more certain of God's eventual deliverance than a weary night watchman is

confident of the sure-to-come dawn. (Ps. 130:6)

cc. It was only the blood of the covenant which assured the prisoners' ransom (v. 11), not schemes or strivings on part of prisoners. God would deliver because He had sworn to be His people's preserving, rescuing God, and then sealed that oath with animal blood. Blood and deliverance belong together. Israel's first great deliverance, its rescue from death in Egypt, was achieved only through blood—the sprinkled blood of a lamb on the door.

B. His significance in the New Testament fulfillment.

1. This King who rides into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday is also a bringer of peace.

a. Not a worldly peace, the absence of pain or conflict. He doesn't dispense divine aspirin tablets that magically whisk away all our troubles and tensions. In fact, He introduces an additional conflict—that constant war between flesh and spirit.

b. But the peace of God. (aa) Peace of power, the power to bear affliction bravely. Example: Jesus gave His disciples peace and then sent them out to face the world's persecution and scorn. (bb) Peace of pardon. This King Jesus was riding into Jerusalem to carry a cross out of the city to the place of the Skull, there to die that we might have the peace of God's pardon.

2. This King who rides into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday is also preaching a powerful sermon on humility, because He came to serve and not be served and then "humbled Himself even unto the death of the cross" that we might be raised to God's right hand.

3. This King who rides into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday also brings us great blessings. (a) He gives us His own righteousness. He is our "Sun of righteousness with healing in His wings." His arms were extended on the cross. By that act of sacrifice we are healed of the disease of sin and are sure of an

eventual healing of all wounds of heart and body. (b) He gives us salvation. Since God delivered Jesus, our King, into death but then rescued Him again from the clutch of the grave, we have deliverance from death. For if the King is saved, so is the nation. (c) He gives us prisoners release, release from the prison of an accusing conscience. For since He was jailed in the prison of death for three days and then broke free again, we have freedom from a guilty conscience.

II. And you! Just one command here: be like Him. That is

A. Be meek. Meekness is not being a "Casper Milquetoast" individual. Rather it means the refusal to rebel against God's guidance in your life, especially when that divine direction may mean that you suffer while the godless about you prosper. (Cf. Ps. 37:8-11)

B. Be humble. Remember, humility is more than an attitude, it is an act. It is doing as Jesus did: humbling yourself unto the death, the death of self-love and self-worship, for a life of service and sacrifice to the brother.

MAUNDY THURSDAY

PSALM 111

This psalm and the Sacrament go together. We call the Lord's Supper a Eucharist, a Thanksgiving. The psalm before us is an order to praise God. Thus it might well be used as a source of lessons about the sacrament instituted on this day. It might be for us

A Sacramental Psalm

I. It commands us to praise God for the Eucharist (v. 1)

A. This is to be a wholehearted praise. Not simply praise that lasts for the brief

moment of actual communing. But rather a praise that takes the form of a constant dedication to the one great command Jesus gave us on this "Command Thursday," this Maundy Thursday: "Love one another as I have loved you!"

B. This is to be a corporate thanksgiving. And isn't that precisely what the sacrament is, the entire body of saints at a given place praising God in the act of communing? We indeed receive great gifts. But in this attendance at the sacramental board we are also giving — giving God praise for the Gift of His Son sacrificed and risen for our pardon and eternal joy. Paul says that we preach to one another about our Lord's death as we partake of this blessed meal. We are saying to one another: "Christ Jesus gave His life to procure God's favor and forgiveness for you."

II. It underscores the marvel and mystery of the Eucharist (v. 3)

A. The reference here, of course, is to God's redemptive works for Israel, starting with the Red Sea rescue and continuing through all her history. They were a part of God's plan of a final redemption.

B. As New Testament saints we can surely apply these words to the Sacrament. This work of God, this Sacred Supper, is indeed a meal to be marveled at, to be praised. It is not a meal to be reasoned out or debated over. Christ did not command us to understand this supper, but to eat it.

III. It helps us remember God's wonderful work (v. 4)

Jesus ordered us to eat this meal to remember Him. Every time we come to this table, we call to mind God's greatest work for us, the work of our Lord's living, dying, and rising that we might enjoy God's fellowship forever. In this work God in Christ

actually "worked Himself to death" and then rose again for our salvation.

IV. It speaks of food for the God-fearing (v. 5)

And isn't this precisely what the Sacrament offers — food for the God-fearing, food that gives us the Christ who was weak for us even to the point of death, to the point of no strength at all? By that weakness of Jesus we are now strong. For because of the weakness of Christ, God has removed from us the crushing load of our sins and now we are strong to do His will.

V. It speaks to us of a faithful God (v. 7)

A. The Old Testament believer was assured by these words that God would always be loyal and true both to His covenant promises of forgiving mercy and grace.

B. For the New Testament saint these words also mean that God will never go back on His promise of the new covenant. In fact, so faithful was God in the keeping of His promise that His faithful hands actually became flesh and blood in Jesus and were nailed to a cross so that He might keep His promise never to remember our sins. And in the Sacrament we receive the blood of our Lord which sealed this new agreement.

VI. It reminds us of redemption (v. 9)

A. The Old Testament redemption from Egypt. It is significant that Christ apparently instituted the Eucharist in connection with the Passover, the meal that kept the Israelites remembering the great deliverance from Pharaoh.

B. The New Testament redemption. In this Holy Supper we eat the body given for us, given into the death of Golgotha for our deliverance from death, hell, and sin for life, heaven, and holiness. In this meal we drink the blood shed for us, poured out upon the cross to rescue us from the outpouring of God's wrath.

GOOD FRIDAY

PSALM 22:1-11

This is a good Good Friday psalm. For it sets before us

Christ's Dying Words

I. They are the words of a forsaken Man (vv. 1, 2)

A. The beloved Son has become the forsaken Child. He cries not "My Father" but "My God." The crucified, suffering Son feels that the Father has disowned Him. He was forsaken that God might always call us His children despite our sins.

B. Yet this forsaken Man on the cross still has the courage to cry "My God!" Picture here a child who wildly, desperately, clings to the legs of a parent who has turned his back on him and is trying to walk away. Jesus in the depths of His unspeakable agony still clings to God. Can you? Can you still cry, "My God," in the depths of your misery?

C. There is an answer to His question.

1. God forsook His Son on the cross that our sins might leave us, that the gulf between our guilt and us might be wider than that between East and West.

2. God forsook His Son on the cross that He might never leave us. Even the eternal mountains will go before our God forsakes us (Is. 54:10). A lot of things will leave us — health, money, goods, loved ones, even life itself. But not our loving, defending God.

II. They are the words of a suffering Man (vv. 6-8)

A. So intense is the agony that it reduces the Sufferer to less than a man. He is a worm. In Gethsemane, our Lord's face was in the dust as He prayed for the passing of His Passion cup. Now, on the cross, He is *all* in the dust, like a worm.

B. The intensity of the suffering is heightened by the fact that the very objects of His

dying love scorn and despise Him (vv. 6, 7). The men for whom He hangs on the tree fling their jeers and insults into His dying face. And this is love—to die for one's enemies. Inspired and infused by that love, go and do likewise. The test and measure of your love is to be found in your patience and kindness to those who tax the control of your tongue and temper to the breaking point.

III. They are the words of a confident Man
(vv. 3-5, 9-11)

A. This confidence is based upon God's past deliverances (vv. 3-5).

1. The poet of this psalm was certain God would eventually rescue him because of the Lord's past deliverances of his ancestors. "God saved the fathers; therefore He will rescue Me. If he performed the miracle of the Red Sea rescue, no strait could ever place me beyond His delivering reach."

2. Christ had the same confidence on the cross. God could and would rescue Him even from His hell of God-forsakenness. His past life proved it. Hadn't His Father delivered Him from Herod's sword? Hadn't that same Father sustained and rescued Him from Sa-

tan's assaults in the desert? Hadn't that Father preserved Him time and again from the clutches of the hateful Pharisees? Therefore even from this most terrible of straits God would deliver Him.

B. We can have that same confidence in our distresses. The Israelite kept returning to God's marvelous and miraculous rescue of his fathers at the Red Sea. That was his proof God would at last "spring" him free from every trouble. We don't return to a rescue by a sea; we go back to a rescue on a hill and in a garden. On the hill of Golgotha, Christ died to deliver us from our sins. From the sealed grave in Joseph's garden He arose to set us free from the prison of our graves. That past rescue is our proof of deliverance from every pain and evil. Therefore we are brave and confident beneath the crushing cross.

IV. He prayed these words so you don't have to

Since Jesus on this day cried: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" you can die with His words "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit" on your lips.

Richmond Heights, Mo.

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

THE JUSTIFICATION OF A SINNER BEFORE GOD

Under this heading the *Scottish Journal of Theology* (September 1960) publishes an excellent article on the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* by Prof. Robert Preus of Concordia Seminary, with special consideration of the doctrine "as taught in later Lutheran Orthodoxy." Dr. Preus reaches the conclusion that "with the forensic justification, with the *iustitia aliena*, with the strong emphasis on the validity and reality of the imputation, we have the basic elements of Lutheran Orthodoxy's doctrine of justification. And if the terminology has changed, the main strands and emphasis of the Reformation teaching remain intact." When the writer here speaks of a change of terminology by the later dogmaticians, he has in mind such expressions of Luther, and occasionally of the Lutheran Confessions, that justification is a divine act by which God *makes* (italics our own) an unrighteous man righteous. Against their Roman Catholic opponents the later Lutheran dogmaticians, above all, Quenstedt, whom Dr. Preus quotes frequently, refrained from such expressions, because by them the Romanists might justify their erroneous teaching of justification by inherent righteousness. Quenstedt thus writes: "Those to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed are truly righteous, although not inherently or by inheritance, but imputatively and through an extrinsic designation that they are such. . . . He who is regarded by God as righteous is truly righteous." We warmly recommend the article for wide and careful perusal, since it stresses important truths which at this time of widespread loose and confused theological presentation should be heeded. By the way, when Luther uses the phrase *gerecht machen*, he uses it quite commonly against the background of his basic

doctrine that justification is a forensic act, which means that God declares a sinner righteous for Jesus' sake and thus makes him righteous.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

THE SCOTS CONFESSION OF 1560

Theology Today (October 1960), under this heading, presents an interesting analysis of the Scottish confession of faith which the "Reformation Parliament," upon the suggestion of John Knox and his colleagues, adopted on Aug. 17, 1560, and which, though superseded in 1647 by the Westminster Confession, never ceased, as the writer states, to hold an honored place in the thought of Scottish Presbyterians. Our interest attached especially to the "doctrine of secular authority," stated in Article XXIV, "Of the Civil Magistrate." We quote in part the writer's analysis:

For all who know even a little of the subsequent history of Scotland and the Scottish Church there is something distinctly pathetic about this paragraph. "We farther confess and acknowledge, that such persons as are placed in authority are to be loved, honoured, feared, and holden in most reverent estimation": Knox and his successors found it hard to repeat such words in connection with Mary Queen of Scots, her son, or indeed any of the Stewart line. "Moreover, to Kings, Princes, Rulers and Magistrates, we affirm that chiefly and most principally the conservation and purgation of the Religion appertains; so that not only they are appointed for civil policy, but also for maintenance of the true religion and for suppressing of idolatry and superstition whatsoever." The hope behind this affirmation was quickly disappointed. Indeed, we may suspect that the ink was hardly dry upon this page of the Confession when zealous Protestants were tempted to seek a loophole in it for rebellion and to concentrate their attention almost exclusively upon one promising phrase: "Such as resist the supreme power, doing that which appertains to his charge,

do resist God's ordinance." What, they asked, if the magistrate fail to do "that which appertains to his charge," or impede others seeking to do that which appertains to theirs? Out of their disillusion and questioning there developed a long and bitter struggle between Church and State in Scotland. But that sorrowful struggle should not blind us to the great truth embodied in Article XXIV of the Confession . . . that the State has a service to render to God. In saying this we think at once of Karl Barth, who has had so many valuable things to say on the relations of Church and State for more than a quarter of a century. . . . But if we think of Barth, we think also of Calvin, for the doctrine of the Confession is indistinguishable here from the doctrine of the *Institutes*. And if we think of Calvin we think also of Paul, to whose teaching in Romans 13 the Scots Reformers are undeniably indebted.

The writer contends that also in its doctrine of "the Magistrate" the Scots Confession is founded on Scripture and stands or falls with it. But while in Romans 13 the apostle commands subjection to the higher powers as an ordinance of God and declares that the ruler is the minister of God to thee for good, he does not say that to kings, princes, rulers, and magistrates appertain chiefly and most principally the conservation and the purgation of religion and that they are appointed also for maintenance of the true religion and for suppressing of idolatry and all superstition. JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

BRIEF ITEMS FROM THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

St. Louis, Mo. — Representatives of the National Lutheran Council and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod resumed formal conversations here on theological issues involved in Lutheran co-operative activities.

Discussion at the second meeting of the two groups, held at the Missouri Athletic Club, Nov. 18—19, centered in "The Significance of Confessional Subscription," dealing with the traditional adherence of Lu-

theran churches to the doctrinal statements contained in the *Book of Concord*.

As was the case at the initial session of the church leaders in Chicago last July 7—9, the exploratory talks here dwelt on theological considerations underlying present and future relations between the NLC and the Missouri Synod.

Participants in the closed conference focused major attention on the way in which the various Lutheran church bodies in America adhere to the Lutheran Confessions as a correct exposition of the Word of God.

Included in this concern was the varying emphasis which the bodies place upon the confessions and the degree to which they require their pastors to accept these writings as the basis of their ministry.

Following nearly six hours of discussion, in an afternoon and a morning session, the 29 conferees issued a prepared statement which said:

"Substantial agreement was reached with reference to (1) designation of the confessions which are involved in subscription; (2) assertion of historical limitations in the confessions; (3) allowance of distinction between the primary norm of the Scriptures and the secondary norm of the confessions; (4) recognition that the heart of the confessions is their witness to the Gospel; (5) acknowledgment that this understanding of the Gospel requires rejection of contradictory understandings; and (6) affirmation of the importance of confessional subscription for the proclamation of the church."

Since there was "substantial agreement on the significance and nature of confessional subscription," the two groups reported that further talks between the NLC and the Missouri Synod are being planned. The third meeting has been tentatively set for next Aug. 1 and 2 in Chicago.

Scheduled for discussion at the meeting in Chicago is the general topic "What kind of co-operation is possible in view of the

discussions to date?" Areas to be considered will include the relation of co-operation to confessional agreement, the relation of witness to co-operation; and the extent of co-operation apart from pulpit and altar fellowship.

Approval was given to publication of the four essays which were read at the first two meetings. The papers dealing with "The Unity of the Gospel" and "The Significance of Confessional Subscription" will be distributed to every Lutheran pastor in America and will also be made available to the public.

Essayists who presented papers on the Lutheran Confessions at the meeting here were, for the NLC, Dr. Theodore G. Tappert, professor of church history at Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa., and for the Missouri Synod, Prof. Herbert J. A. Bouman, professor of systematics at Concordia Theological Seminary in St. Louis.

Need for restudy of confessional subscription by the NLC-Missouri Synod conferees was acknowledged at their first session. According to the official minutes of the meeting, both groups stressed "the importance of avoiding caricatures of the positions and practices of various Lutheran bodies" on the question of their loyalty to the Lutheran Confessions.

Discussion at the first meeting last July was based on Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. Dealing with church unity, the article declares in part: "And to the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments."

Essays on this subject were presented by Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College at Rock Island, Ill., for the NLC, and Dr. Martin H. Franzmann of Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, for the Missouri Synod.

"The *rapprochement* at both meetings has been an encouragement to future Lutheran relations in the United States," said a spokes-

man for the nine Lutheran bodies represented at the sessions.

Present at the meeting were Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director of the NLC, who was stricken with a heart attack during the first session of the two groups last July. Dr. Empie has made rapid progress toward recovery and returned to his duties on a part-time basis in mid-September.

Also in attendance from the council were Dr. Norman A. Menter of Berkley, Mich., its president, and Dr. David Granskou, secretary of its Department of Theological Cooperation in the Division of Lutheran World Federation Affairs.

Other members of the NLC's executive committee present, in addition to Dr. Menter, were the presidents of the council's eight participating bodies: Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, New York, United Lutheran Church in America; Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz, Evangelical Lutheran Church; Dr. Malvin H. Lundeen, Augustana Lutheran Church; Dr. William Larsen, United Evangelical Lutheran Church; and Dr. John M. Stensvaag, Lutheran Free Church, all of Minneapolis; Dr. Henry F. Schuh, Columbus, Ohio, American Lutheran Church; Dr. Raymond Wargelin, Hancock, Mich., Suomi Synod; and Dr. Alfred Jensen, Des Moines, Iowa, American Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The executive committee was also represented by Dr. Frank K. Efrid, Salisbury, N.C.; Dr. Donald R. Heiges, Chicago; Dr. Raymond Olson, Minneapolis; Mr. Harold Levander, St. Paul, Minn.; and Dr. F. Eppling Reinartz, New York.

The NLC's consulting theologians were Dr. Bergendoff and Dr. Tappert; Dr. Edward C. Fendt, president of Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. Alvin Rogness, president of Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; and Dr. Walter Kukkonen of the Suomi Synod's faculty at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Ill.

Representing the Missouri Synod were Dr. John W. Behnken, its president, Dr. George W. Wittmer, third vice-president, and Dr. Lawrence B. Meyer, planning counselor, all of St. Louis.

Also, Dr. Alfred O. Fuerbringer, president of Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis; Dr. Franzmann and Dr. Bouman, both of that seminary faculty; Dr. George Beto, president of Concordia Theological Seminary at Springfield, Ill.; and the Rev. Theodore F. Nickel, president of the Northern Illinois District and pastor of Jehovah Lutheran Church, Chicago.

New York.—Irving C. Pearson, a 40-year-old Montana lawyer and Lutheran layman, has been appointed director of Taiwan Church World Service, the relief and service agency of Protestant churches and missions in Taiwan. He was named to the post by both Lutheran World Relief and Church World Service, relief agencies co-operating in the shipment of substantial quantities of food, clothing, and medicine to Taiwan.

Mr. Pearson succeeds Barry Schuttler, who has been director of the program for the last two years. The new director will supervise a program that reaches some 1,800,000 people. Distribution of about 30,000 tons of relief materials sent annually by LWR and CWS is through congregational committees, institutions, feeding stations, and schools.

Taiwan is the only area in the world where a co-operative Protestant-Roman Catholic food program is in operation. Agencies of the two faiths distribute to the same people on alternate months.

Mr. Pearson, a member of the Augustana Lutheran Church, and his wife and three children—Andrew, 7, Jeffrey, 5, and Nancy, 3—left their Anaconda, Mont., home late in November and were scheduled to sail from San Francisco on Dec. 2 aboard the *Gopher State*.

The new relief director, who said he accepted the appointment after he and his wife decided to "do something about serving the

church instead of just talking about it," has been in private law practice in Anaconda since 1951 and has been part owner of a real estate and insurance agency.

Copenhagen.—The road to Christian unity is a "road back"—but it is back to Christ and not back to Rome, the Lutheran World Federation's Commission on Inter-confessional Research was told here. Bishop Hermann Dietzfelbinger of Munich, Germany, chairman of the commission, declared that Biblical allusion to one flock under one shepherd referred only to Christ Himself and not to the pope.

Martin Luther's work as a church reformer was begun with an ecumenical perspective, said Dr. Dietzfelbinger, whose 2,500,000-member Bavarian Evangelical Lutheran Church is situated in the most Roman Catholic part of Germany. But, he added, Luther's ecumenical goal was "Back to Christ alone, to the Holy Scriptures, to faith and truth."

He contrasted this position with that of the Roman Church which, Bishop Dietzfelbinger said, "demands distinctly, plainly and clearly the return to Rome" as the basis of Christian unity. "It refuses to acknowledge that it, too, can be at fault and commit errors."

While taking account of present contacts between Rome and non-Catholic churches and noting that the hopes of even Catholics had been raised by the papal announcement that an "ecumenical council" would be held, he commented, "But meanwhile it has become quite clear that Rome understands 'ecumenical' only in the sense of Roman Catholic."

Christian unity must not be an end in itself, nor must it be sought out of human enthusiasm, the German churchman asserted. "The one church must be a community in Christ as the only Savior of the World." He reiterated that for followers of the Reformation the ecumenical road is "not return to Rome but only a return of all of us to Christ alone."

BOOK REVIEW

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis 18, Missouri.

DIE MITTE DER ZEIT: STUDIEN ZUR THEOLOGIE DES LUKAS. By Hans Conzelmann. 3d edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960. 241 pages. Paper, DM 23.60; cloth, DM 27.

This is a revision of a work which has already won wide acclaim. Conzelmann aims to prove that in Luke's writings we see for the first time a conscious awareness of the differentiation between the time of Jesus and the time of the church.

In answer to the church's problems arising from the delay of an expected Parousia and a hostile pagan environment Luke, by a reworking of the materials at his disposal, demonstrates that history is divinely ordered by God's saving purpose (*Heilsgeschichte*).

The Lucan corpus presents this *Heilsgeschichte* in three stages: (1) The time of Israel, concentrated in the ministry of John the Baptist, Luke 16:16; (2) the midpoint, the time of Jesus' work (*die Mitte der Zeit*), during which Satan is bound; (3) the time of the church, characterized by patient endurance under the guidance of the Spirit.

Luke's adherence to this scheme is apparent in his editing of his sources, Conzelmann believes, especially in respect to geographical notations. The Jordan River area is closely associated with John the Baptist, but a new period begins with the work of Jesus. Therefore Luke dissociates Jesus from the Jordan area (cf. 4:1) and highlights Galilee (4:14), where Jesus collects His witnesses. Luke 9:51—19:27 is presented in the form of a travel account to give expression to the precise nature of Jesus' role as a *suffering* Messiah. A third section, with

its emphasis on Jerusalem, locates the basis for the church's conviction that she is the true Israel of God.

Conzelmann sets forth a careful differentiation between the three major epochs by a careful analysis of Luke's eschatology. Luke's insight that the Spirit is the Substitute for the Parousia clarifies much of his editorial activity. From the church's apologetic, in the face of Jewish and Roman criticism, it is evident that she understands herself as involved in *Heilsgeschichte*. The continuity between the church's existence and the history of Jesus is undergirded by a more detailed examination of the time of Jesus' work, i. e., *die Mitte der Zeit*. The opposition of Jews versus church is typically anticipated in the Jewish opposition to Jesus. In his concluding section Conzelmann shows that the description of the church of the apostles is not an ideal for the later church to imitate, but marks the link between Old and New Israel.

In a new edition the author should spend more time on the details of the prolog to the Gospel, which suggest that concern for historical detail loomed larger than Conzelmann seems to allow. The hypothesis of Luke's travel account as a theological tract requires further demonstration to make the proposal convincing. Whether Luke's *Heilsgeschichte* approach is so novel as far as the New Testament is concerned might be evaluated at greater length in the light of Paul's repeated emphasis on the continuity of the New Israel with the Old Israel.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

THE LETTERS TO THE GALATIANS AND EPHESIANS. By William Barclay. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 218 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

THE LETTERS TO THE PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND THESSALONIANS. By William Barclay. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959. 253 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

These pocket-size books are written by a Scottish theological professor who has the knack of bringing the fruits of his scholarly studies down to the level of nontheologically trained readers. The two books of which we here take note are installments in the American edition of Barclay's *Daily Study Bible*, originally sponsored by the Church of Scotland and extensively used in the British Isles. The writer presents his own excellent translation of the various books, divides the material into short sections for daily reading, gives enough illuminating remarks on the text itself to make it intelligible, then makes pointed application to the practical Christian life. The books could well be read consecutively or used as quick reference commentaries. While we would not subscribe to every interpretation of Barclay, we do not hesitate to recommend his stimulating books to our readers.

VICTOR BARTLING

JESUS AND THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY. By Maurice Goguel. Vol. I: *Prolegomena to the Life of Jesus*; 225 pages; \$1.35. Vol. II: *The Life of Jesus*; 590 pages; \$1.85. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. Paper.

These two volumes are a "Torchbook" reprint of a work that was originally accorded a cold reception. The passing of the years and an altered critical climate, not the least element of which is the present growing interest in the historical circumstances surrounding the life of Jesus, encourage a fresh appraisal and appreciation of a book that

was designed to locate the irreducible minimum of ascertainable fact in the Gospel narratives in the face of the pulverizing idealistic attack spearheaded by one Rudolf Bultmann. This book must be carefully read by anyone who desires to enter the current critical debate. FREDERICK W. DANKER

WEISHEIT UND TORHEIT: EINE EXEGETISCHE - RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE UNTERSUCHUNG ZU I. KOR. 1 UND 2. By Ulrich Wilckens. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959. 299 pages. Paper. DM 28.70.

The writer of this monograph takes issue with the traditional view that Paul in his polemic against "the wisdom of this world" (1 Cor. 2:6) had in mind his general Hellenistic philosophical environment. Rather, he holds, the object of Paul's attack is specifically Corinthian Gnosticism, which interprets Christ as the Gnostic Revealer-Redeemer who comes to earth, hoodwinks the hostile "powers," and through Gnosis leads his initiates back to union with God. Through Baptism, this theory taught, the Corinthians have taken a transeschatological stance. The judgment is behind them, and they can be independent of the apostles, with the exception of those who baptized them. Hence the allegiance to Cephas, Apollos, and Paul. Since the Corinthians have by means of Baptism won the eschatological benefits, through the *exalted* Christ, they need have nothing to do with the crucifixion and can disclaim its relevance for Christian existence.

To combat this sabotage, Paul accommodates himself to the language of the misguided members in Corinth and brings the heretical missiles back to their launching pad. He is a true "pneumatic." It is they who are "fleshly." They and the world are "foolish." The crucified Christ is God's "wisdom."

Significant in the argumentation is the repeated mention of *sophia* rather than *gnosis*.

Striking also is the equation by the Corinthians of the glorified Christ with *sophia*. Jewish apocalyptic expression and Hellenistic Gnostic ideas here reach Paul in a confluence. This circumstance prompts Wilckens in a second part to discuss the religiohistorical background of *sophia*. A careful study of the Valentinian system, the Acts of Thomas, Philo, and others leads to the convincing conclusion, and not without taking account of the genetic fallacy, that it is not at all unlikely that the Corinthians hypostasized *sophia* and viewed the glorified Christ accordingly.

In his third major portion, Wilckens discusses the structure and intention of the Pauline proclamation of the Cross. The preaching of the Cross shatters all human self-confidence. God is the principal agent. Hence where is the *wise* man? The crucified Christ is God's brand of power. It must accordingly appear as foolishness to man whose criteria are subject to scrutiny in the proclamation of the foolishness of the Cross. The apostle's person is in close relationship to this unique approach of God. The Corinthians fail to see how a pneumatic revealer like Christ should be associated with such a weak pneumatic like Paul. Paul's reply is Christologically centered. The weakness of the crucified Christ must be matched by a weak apostle, for only thus can the power of God really assert itself. The power of God is in the crucifixion and in the foolishness of its proclamation by Christ's fools.

In his fourth and concluding section Wilckens demonstrates the broad bite of Paul's critique by pointing out the levels of contact between Stoicism and Gnostic thought.

This brief summary cannot begin to do justice to the treasures imbedded in this monograph. The Corinthian correspondence has been handled gingerly enough by commentators. Here is a confident, firm treatment

which lights up much that has long been murky and gives the lie to those who think that there is little fresh to discover in the pages of Holy Writ. The few unconvincing moments, such as the suggestion of a gloss in the reference to the Christ-party (p. 17, n. 2) and a labored interpretation of ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ (1 Cor. 1:21) as used in a local sense, do not appreciably diminish the value of this exegetical masterpiece, which will most certainly become a classic.

FREDERICK W. DANKER

THE CHRIST OF THE EARLIEST CHRISTIANS. By William M. Ramsay. Richmond: John Knox Press, c. 1959. 163 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

This rewrite of a doctoral dissertation is an outstanding book. Presbyterian Ramsay's thesis is that by a careful study of the sermons of the Book of Acts the Christ of the earliest Christians emerges as a lofty but complex figure. Side by side in the early witness is the cosmic Savior of Jewish apocalyptic Messianism; the kingly Son of David and promised Prophet who fulfills the Old Testament; the human Jesus, who lived and died; the Servant of God risen and exalted to the right hand of God; the living and present Lord of the church, whose saving name is with His people. In especially interesting chapters the author analyzes the similar but in some respects unique witness to Christ in the preaching of Stephen and Paul. In conclusion Ramsay demonstrates how the New Testament writers usually highlight one Christological accent from the early witness (e.g., the apocalyptic Christ in Revelation, Christ the Fulfiller in Hebrews) and try to bring that in conjunction with some other aspect of the early testimony.

What makes this such a useful book is not only its Biblical vigor but also the clarity of its conclusions and the persuasive warmth of its faith. Ramsay concludes that such

a study refutes not only the old liberal evolutionary thesis that the Christ of the earliest Christians is a simple humanitarian but also the traditional view that the Nicene Christology can simply be read back into the New Testament as well as the form-critical view of a nonearthly eschatological Christ. Yet the author is never merely negative. In fact his polemic, while crystal clear, is subservient to his always positive conclusions for faith which are suggested in each chapter. This produces a book which also laymen can and should read.

HENRY W. REIMANN

REVELATION AND EXISTENCE. By H. P. Owen. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1957. 160 pages. Cloth. 15/—.

Owen here offers an exceptionally clear and perceptive analysis of Bultmann's understanding of Christian revelation and man's response to it. He begins his study by pointing to the inadequacy of Bultmann's description of myth, since it is so general as to include every possible statement which could be made about God, and the inconsistency with which he uses the term, as when Bultmann feels bound to demythologize miracles and exorcisms.

Owen is most helpful in presenting the nature of Bultmann's subjective existentialism, namely, the exchange of the objective Word and the incarnation for their subjective correlates, and the hypostatic Word for the Word of address. This exchange is so radical (and absurd, Owen would say) that there occurs no contact between the historic Christ and His work and the Christ through whom God addresses us in encounter.

In his study of Bultmann's idea of a purely formal encounter, Owen rightly refuses to accept the cleavage between the Jewish emphasis on "hearing" and the Greek emphasis on "seeing" or "understanding." The two concepts are blended in the New Testament, he says. To obey God and to believe God

to be the source of truth is the same. "Hearing" always presupposes "seeing."

Bultmann's subjectivism, Owen holds, dichotomizes *Historie* and *Geschichte*. Like Kierkegaard Bultmann says that objective, historical evidence cannot work faith. Owen counters that historical evidence is indeed *insufficient by itself*, but it is not *irrelevant*, as Bultmann says. For example, historical evidence renders the resurrection of Christ highly probable, but only personal acceptance of the risen Christ makes this a certainty for the individual.

For one who wishes a clear description and a discerning analysis of Bultmann's basic ideas this book cannot be recommended too highly.

ROBERT D. PREUS

A GREEK SYNOPSIS OF THE GOSPELS: A NEW WAY OF SOLVING THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM. By Monseigneur de Solages; translated from the French by J. Baisus. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959. 1128 pages. Cloth. Price not given.

This volume is not an attempt to replace Huck-Lietzmann-Cross or Burton-Goodspeed. Actually the Greek harmony of the gospels given here is a by-product of an attempt to provide a solution to the synoptic problem through the use of a rigorous system of statistical analysis. The author claims that this method is more nearly objective than any other (pp. 8, 9). He is probably right.

De Solages looks for words that are identical, equivalent, similar, or analogous in form and meaning as well as for those words that are peculiar to each of the synoptics. As the harmony progresses, he compiles cumulative statistics showing the relation of each gospel to the others in terms of these categories. He uses these statistics to eliminate all but one of the 64 possible relations (statistically, not actually, possible) among three related literary texts. His conclusions underscore the two-document hypothesis as formulated by

Streeter on the basis of literary analysis. The priority of Mark seems to be demonstrated. While there are many places, perhaps, where another analysis would place an individual word into a slightly different category, the mass of evidence seems to be incontrovertible. A more serious objection might be raised—that the analysis as practiced makes no allowance for the position of the word in the sentence. At times this seems to suggest that even identical words are not identical in use. But once again, there is not enough variation to destroy the cumulative argument.

The English translation is not always the easiest to follow, nor is the division of words at the end of the line of type well executed. In a work of this magnitude, however, it is foolish to cavil at such drawbacks. Without a doubt this work adds another tool useful for the solution of the synoptic problem.

EDGAR KRENTZ

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Volume I: *Chapters 1—8.* By John Murray. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960. xxv and 408 pages. Cloth. \$5.00.

Users of the New International Commentary on the New Testament have been looking forward to the exposition of Romans by Westminster Seminary's professor of systematic theology. The first half of the work lies before us. Unquestionably Murray's commentary will have the same high rating in conservative circles as Charles Hodge's commentary on Romans had in earlier generations. And as our Lutheran exegete Stoeckhardt used and valued Hodge, Lutheran exegetes of today will benefit from Murray's painstaking, thorough, and well-written work. Like Hodge, Murray represents classical Calvinism in his theological outlook. There will never be a definitive commentary on Romans. Each worker must keep on digging for himself in this inexhaustible mine, but while

doing this he will gladly avail himself of the aid given by previous workers. Murray will always be consulted with profit. He should have a special appeal to fellow systematians. An appendix contains a 27-page essay on Justification; 12 pages on the phrase "from faith to faith"; shorter essays on Is. 53:11 and on Karl Barth's interpretation of Romans 5. We hope that the sequel volume may soon appear. For the benefit of readers who do not know the series of which this commentary is a part we may state that the series is so constructed that the commentaries can be used by readers who are not familiar with Greek and Hebrew. Technical aspects of exegesis are relegated to footnotes, special notes, or appendices.

VICTOR BARTLING

CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Charles M. Laymon. New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1958. 256 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

This is a very comprehensive analysis of the portrait of Christ found in the New Testament. Laymon, editor of adult publications for The Methodist Church, uses all the technical equipment of critical introduction and exegesis to apply, in a very readable and practical way, to his topic the unity-in-variety theme of modern Biblical theology. If anything, the book suffers through its very smooth thoroughness. On the one hand it may not be quite original and specific enough for the critical scholar, although there is a wealth of footnotes and bibliography. On the other hand it might prove too wordy and bulky for most laymen. As a reference compend it should prove very useful. In a brilliant conclusion Laymon indirectly points to the limitations of his own strictly New Testament work. "Only as we read the New Testament in relation to God's total revelation in the Scriptures does Christ in his fullness lay hold of us." (P. 230)

HENRY W. REIMANN

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of a book in this list acknowledges its receipt and does not preclude further discussion of its contents in the Book Review section)

The Courage to Be. By Paul Tillich. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959. ix and 197 pages. Paper. 95 cents. A paperback reissue of one of Tillich's boldest and most original works, first published in 1952, in which he provides an Existentialist interpretation of anxiety and courage.

Aristotle: Metaphysics, trans. Richard Hope. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960. xvii and 394 pages. Paper. \$2.45. A welcome paperback reissue of a standard translation of one of the most important works in the history of Western philosophy.

Classics of Medicine and Surgery, ed. C. N. B. Camac. New York: Dover Publications, 1959. 435 pages. Paper. \$2.25. A paperback reprint of milestone papers in the history of medicine, first published in 1909 as *Epoch-Making Contributions to Medicine, Surgery, and Allied Sciences*.

The Gospel According to Rome. By John H. Gerstner. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. 34 pages. Paper. 50 cents. A reprint of a number of polemical articles that originally appeared in the *United Presbyterian* and the *Christian Union Herald*.

The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought. By W. M. Ramsay. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. xvi and 452 pages. Paper. \$2.79. An unaltered paperback reissue of a perennial classic first published in book form in 1907.

Letters to Young Churches: A Translation of the New Testament Epistles. By J. B. Phillips. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960. xiv and 225 pages. Paper. \$1.25. This paperback reissue of one of the most readable popular paraphrases of the New Testament letters (first published in 1947) is priced low enough to make it generally available to even small budgets.

The System of Thomas Aquinas. By Maurice de Wulf. New York: Dover Publications, 1959. 151 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

A paperback reissue of a distinguished medievalist's work originally published under the title *Medieval Philosophy Illustrated from Thomas Aquinas*.

The Shaker Adventure. By Marguerite Fellows Melcher. Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1960. ix and 319 pages. Paper. \$3.00. An unaltered reprint of the first edition published by the Princeton University Press in 1941. The authoress of this highly readable and carefully written work is herself descended collaterally from Shaker stock.

The Holy Spirit and Our Faith. By J. N. Kildahl; revised by Rolf E. Aaseng and Grace Gabrielsen. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. ix and 86 pages. Paper. \$1.00. First published in 1927 as *Misconceptions of the Word and Work of the Holy Spirit* and republished in 1937 as *Ten Studies on the Holy Spirit*, this new edition has been revised by Rolf E. Aaseng and Grace Gabrielsen for the Department of Parish Education of The American Lutheran Church.

Memoirs of McCheyne. Part II: *Including His Messages and Miscellaneous Papers*, ed. Andrew A. Bonar. Chicago: Moody Press, n.d. 252 pages. Paper. Price not given. Robert Murray McCheyne (1813-43) was a famous Scottish Presbyterian preacher. This collection of "Bible messages," papers and poems, first collected and published by his friend, Andrew A. Bonar, in 1844, went through 116 English editions in 25 years. It documents adequately both McCheyne's homiletical method and his theological position.

Heinrich Schütz: His Life and Work. By Hans Joachim Moser; translated from the second revised German edition by Carl Pfatteicher. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. xxvi and 740 pages and xvi plates. Cloth. \$15.00.

Neige des Historismus: Ernst Troeltschs Entwicklungsgang. By Walter Bodenstein.

Güte
Mohr
A
Chur
Gran
Com
Th
olog
New
pages
He
By C
Press
An
Walt
1960
Th
Com
York
75 ce
Th
a Co
New
Paper
Th
Lewis
Press
Ca
bat (C
By J
Thur
1959
Th
378-
John
versit
Paper
Ha
ische
Züric
Oskar
ix and
Re
agawa
1960
Pla
lation

Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1959. 216 pages. Cloth. DM 9.80.

A Guide to the Teachings of the Early Church Fathers. By Robert R. Williams. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960. 224 pages. Cloth. \$4.00.

The Borderland: An Exploration of Theology in English Literature. By Roger Lloyd. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960. 111 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

Here's How to Succeed with Your Money. By George M. Bowman. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 191 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

An Outline of New Testament Survey. By Walter M. Dunnnett. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 176 pages. Paper. Price not given.

The Book of Numbers: Part 2 with a Commentary. By Frederick L. Moriarty. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. 80 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

The Book of Deuteronomy: Part 1 with a Commentary. By George S. Glanzman. New York: Paulist Press, 1960. 79 pages. Paper. 75 cents.

The Church and Secular Education. By Lewis Bliss Whittemore. Greenwich: Seabury Press, 1960. ix and 130 pages. Cloth. \$3.25.

Calvin: Der Mann, den Gott bezwungen hat (Calvin—L'homme que Dieu a dompté). By Jean Cadier; translated by Matthias Thurneysen. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1959. 216 pages. Cloth. Swiss Francs 14.80.

The Art of War in the Middle Ages, A.D. 378—1515. By C. W. C. Oman; edited by John H. Beeler. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1953. xviii and 176 pages. Paper. \$1.75.

Huldrych Zwingli. Band 4: Reformatorische Erneuerung von Kirche und Volk in Zürich und in der Eidgenossenschaft. By Oskar Farner. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1960. ix and 574 pages. Cloth. Swiss Francs 15.00.

Religions of the East. By Joseph M. Kitagawa. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. 319 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

Plato's Examination of Pleasure: A Translation of the Philebus, with Introduction and

Commentary. By R. Hackforth. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1960. vii and 144 pages. Paper. \$1.00.

Plato's Phaedrus: Translated with Introduction and Commentary. By R. Hackforth. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1960. ix and 172 pages. Paper. \$1.15.

Prepare Yourself to Serve: God's Call to a Life of Discipline and Service. By Dorothy Strauss. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 127 pages. Cloth. \$2.50.

It's Your Business, Teen-ager! By Margaret J. Anderson. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 96 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

The Victory Life in Psalm 119. By S. Franklin Logsdon. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 127 pages. Paper. Price not given.

Great Sermons by Great Preachers, ed. Peter F. Gunther. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 159 pages. Paper. Price not given.

The Church Meets Judaism. By Otto Piper, Jakob Jocz, and Harold Floreen. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1960. xiv and 98 pages. Paper. \$1.75.

Pauline Mysticism: Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St. Paul (Die Christumystik des Apostels Paulus). By Alfred Wikenhauser; translated by Joseph Cunningham. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960. 256 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

Redemptive Counseling: Relating Psychotherapy to the Personal Meanings in Redemption. By Dayton G. Van Deusen. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960. 191 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Splinters from an African Log. By Martha Wall. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 319 pages. Cloth. \$3.75.

Arrows of His Bow. By Sanna Morrison Barlow. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 208 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

Come Wind, Come Weather: The Present Experience of the Church in China. By Leslie T. Lyall. Chicago: Moody Press, 1960. 95 pages. Cloth. \$2.00.

Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return (Le Mythe de l'éternel retour:

archetypes et répétition). By Mircea Eliade; translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. xvi and 176 pages. Paper. \$1.35.

The Story of Israel: From Joshua to Alexander the Great. By Stephen Szikszai. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960. 96 pages. Cloth. \$1.50.

The Story of the Scottish Reformation. By A. M. Renwick. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960. 176 pages. Paper. \$1.25.

Train Up a Child: Educational Ideals in the Ancient World. By William Barclay. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960. 288 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

Varieties of Protestantism. By John B. Cobb, Jr. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960. 272 pages. Cloth. \$4.50.

We Bring Christ: Messages and Bible Studies for Preaching-Teaching-Reaching. By William F. Beck. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. 82 pages. Paper. \$1.00.

La Primauté de Pierre dans l'Église orthodoxe. By N. Afanassieff, N. Koulomzine, J. Meyendorff, A. Schemann. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1960. 150 pages. Paper. Price not given.

The Stranger of Galilee: Meditations on the Life of our Lord. By Reginald E. O. White. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960. 203 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

The German Phoenix: Men and Movements in the Church in Germany. By Franklin Hamlin Littell. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1960. xv and 226 pages. Cloth. \$3.95.

The Vocabulary of the Church: A Pronunciation Guide. By Richard C. White. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960. xiv and 178 pages. Cloth. \$3.50.

New Testament Reading Guide. By Roderrick A. F. MacKenzie, Gerard S. Sloyan, Carroll Stuhlmueller, David M. Stanley, Neal

M. Flanagan, Bruce Vawter, Barnabas M. Ahern, Claude J. Peifer, Robert T. Siebenick, John F. McConnell, Eugene H. Maly, Raymond E. Brown. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1960. Twelve pamphlets of from 47 to 128 pages each at 30 cents apiece.

Community of Fear. By Harrison Brown and James Real. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1960. 40 pages. Paper. Price not given.

Our Church and Others: Beliefs and Practices of American Churches. By Lewis W. Spitz. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960. 160 pages. Paper. 60 cents.

Dynamics of Faith. By Paul Tillich. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958. ix and 134 pages. Paper. 95 cents.

Teaching Luther's Catechism II (Katechismus-Auslegung II). By Herbert Girsengsohn; translated by John W. Doberstein. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. ix and 130 pages. Cloth. \$3.00.

Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias, ed. Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960. 259 pages. Paper. Price not given.

The Lutheran Liturgy. Revised edition. By Luther D. Reed. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. xxiii and 824 pages. Cloth. \$9.75.

Existential Metaphysics. By Alvin Thalhheimer. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. viii and 632 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

Classics in Philosophy and Ethics: A Course of Selected Reading by Authorities, ed. C. E. M. Joad. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. xxvi and 313 pages. Cloth. \$6.00.

The Biblical View of Sex and Marriage. By Otto A. Piper. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1960. xii and 239 pages. Cloth. \$3.95.

Luther and the Lutheran Church, 1483 to 1960. By Altman K. Swihart. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. xii and 703 pages. Cloth. \$7.50.

M.
nick,
Ray-
itur-
rom
e.

own
Cen-
ions,

Prac-
W.
hing
ents.
New
and

chis-
ohn;
udel-
130

Fest-
lther
ann,
ren.
tion.
alen-
loth.

Thal-
rary,
).

course
C. E.
rary,
00.

iage.
crib-
loth.

3 to
ork:
703